DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 229 SO 023 177

AUTHOR Hasbach, Corinna; And Others
TITLE Powerful Social Studies: Concepts That Count. Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 88.
INSTITUTION Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, East Lansing, MI.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 93
CONTRACT G0087C0226
NOTE 98p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034 ($9).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary School Students; Grade 5; *History Instruction; *Humanistic Education; Intermediate Grades; Self Actualization; *Social Studies; *Student Development; *United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Literacy in Science and Social Science Project

ABSTRACT

This report examines cases of students learning from their experiences in a fifth grade classroom as they studied a U.S. history curriculum organized around concepts that would not only help students understand history but also be powerful in their lives, concepts that planners hoped would make students more human. The teacher-researchers also considered themselves as learners through the collaborative work done within the Literacy in Science and Social Science Project. This report explores how social studies in this particular context was powerful or not for these particular fifth grade students, powerful in understanding U.S. history, powerful in text analysis, and powerful in analyzing their own lives. The report is not an attempt to show exemplary practice. Instead, it is an attempt to open up dialogue surrounding the teaching and learning of social issues and social justice in the context of social studies. The study seeks to address such questions as: What is powerful social studies? Whose history is being taught in the schools? For whom is it powerful, those who dominate or those who are dominated? For what purposes is it powerful? and Powerful to dominate or to liberate? Contains 57 references and 4 appendices.) (Author/SG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

IRT
Price
$9.00

Elementary Subjects Center
Series No. 88

POWERFUL SOCIAL STUDIES: CONCEPTS THAT COUNT

Corinna Hasbach and Kathleen J. Roth
Elaine Hoekwater, Cheryl L. Rosaen

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. PETERSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects

Institute for Research on Teaching
College of Education
Michigan State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MSU is an affirmative action/equal opportunity institution

SO 023 177

Elementary Subjects Center
Series No. 88

POWERFUL SOCIAL STUDIES: CONCEPTS THAT COUNT

Corinna Hasbach and Kathleen J. Roth
Elaine Hoekwater, Cheryl L. Rosaen

with
Literacy in Science
and Social Studies Colleagues

Kathleen Peasley, Constanza Hazelwood,
Barbara Lindquist, and Carol Ligett

Published by

The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects
Institute for Research on Teaching
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

March 1993

This work is sponsored in part by the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University. The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or Department (Cooperative Agreement No. G0087C0226).

Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects

The **Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects** was awarded to Michigan State University in 1987 after a nationwide competition. Funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, the Elementary Subjects Center is a major project housed in the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). The program focuses on conceptual understanding, higher order thinking, and problem solving in elementary school teaching of mathematics, science, social studies, literature, and the arts. Center researchers are identifying exemplary curriculum, instruction, and evaluation practices in the teaching of these school subjects; studying these practices to build new hypotheses about how the effectiveness of elementary schools can be improved; testing these hypotheses through school-based research; and making specific recommendations for the improvement of school policies, instructional materials, assessment procedures, and teaching practices. Research questions include, What content should be taught when teaching these subjects for understanding and use of knowledge? How do teachers concentrate their teaching to use their limited resources best? and In what ways is good teaching subject matter-specific?

The work is designed to unfold in three phases, beginning with literature review and interview studies designed to elicit and synthesize the points of view of various stakeholders (representatives of the underlying academic disciplines, intellectual leaders and organizations concerned with curriculum and instruction in school subjects, classroom teachers, state- and district-level policymakers) concerning ideal curriculum, instruction, and evaluation practices in these five content areas at the elementary level. Phase II involves interview and observation methods designed to describe current practice, and in particular, best practice as observed in the classrooms of teachers believed to be outstanding. Phase II also involves analysis of curricula (both widely used curriculum series and distinctive curricula developed with special emphasis on conceptual understanding and higher order applications), as another approach to gathering information about current practices. In Phase III, models of ideal practice will be developed, based on what has been learned and synthesized from the first two phases, and will be tested through classroom intervention studies.

The findings of Center research are published by the IRT in the Elementary Subjects Center Series. Information about the Center is included in the IRT Communication Quarterly (a newsletter for practitioners) and in lists and catalogs of IRT publications. For more information, to receive a list or catalog, or to be placed on the IRT mailing list to receive the newsletter, please write to the Editor, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Co-directors:	Jere E. Brophy and Penelope L. Peterson
Senior Researchers:	Patricia Cianciolo, Sandra Hollingsworth, Wanda May, Richard Prawat, Ralph Putnam, Taffy Raphael, Cheryl Rosaen, Kathleen Roth, Pamela Schram, Suzanne Wilson
Editor:	Sandra Gross
Editorial Assistant:	Tom Bowden

Abstract

In this report we examine cases of students' learning from their experiences in a fifth grade classroom as they studied a U.S. history curriculum organized around concepts that would not only help students understand history but also be powerful in their lives--concepts that we hoped would make our students more human. We also consider ourselves--the teacher-researchers--as learners through the collaborative work we did within the Literacy in Science and Social Studies Project. This report explores how social studies in this particular context was powerful or not for these particular fifth-grade students--powerful in understanding U.S history, powerful in text analysis, and powerful in analyzing their own lives. This report is not an attempt to show exemplary practice. Instead, it is an attempt to open up dialogue surrounding the teaching and learning of social issues and social justice in the context of social studies. This report seeks to provoke all of us to ask the vexing questions of, What is "powerful" social studies? Whose history are we teaching in schools? For whom is it powerful--for those who dominate or those who are dominated? For what purposes is it powerful? Powerful to dominate or to liberate?

POWERFUL SOCIAL STUDIES: CONCEPTS THAT COUNT[1]

Corinna Hasbach and Kathleen J. Roth,
Elaine Hoekwater, Cheryl L. Rosaen

with Literacy in Science and Social Studies Colleagues

Kathleen Peasley, Constanza Hazelwood, Barbara Linquist, and Carol Ligett[2]

> I am a survivor of a concentration camp. My eyes saw what no person should witness. Gas chambers built by learned engineers. Children poisoned by educated physicians. Infants killed by trained nurses. Women and babies shot and killed by high school and college graduates. So I'm suspicious of education. My request is: help your students to be human. Your efforts must never produce learned monsters, skilled psychopaths, or educated Eichmanns. Reading and writing and spelling and history and arithmetic are only important if they serve to make our students human. (School principal, cited in Buscaglia, 1982, p. 130)

> NEW HOPE, Minn. (AP)--
> Some fans at a high school hockey game chanted anti-Semitic taunts and threw bagels onto the ice before police stood between the two sides. . . . Some adults and students in the crowd of about 200 chanted, "Jews!" and "We have Christmas, how about you?" at the St. Louis Park team . . . after the game . . . students in the parking lot [were] raising their hands in Nazi-style salutes. . . . "There are insensitivities in our society, and sometimes younger people act them out," he [the principal] said. "The answer is to educate students to stay away from that." ("Anti-Semitic jeers," 1993)

Since the Fall of 1989, our group of educators from a university and elementary school has been working at a Professional Development School (PDS) in a project called Literacy in Science and Social Studies (LISSS). The focus of our work has been to explore ways to genuinely engage students in their education and to create classrooms that are learning settings for <u>all</u>

---

[1]When we state "concepts that count" we are not implying that these are the only concepts that should/could be used. Instead, we are saying we chose concepts which raised issues for exploring conflicts in history and contemporary society. We found that these concepts were powerful in our particular context for these particular students.

[2]Corinna Hasbach, a doctoral candidate in teacher education at Michigan State University, is a research assistant with the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects. Kathleen J. Roth, associate professor of teacher education at MSU, is a senior researcher with the Center. Elaine Hoekwater teaches fifth grade at an MSU Professional Development School. Cheryl L. Rosaen, assistant professor of teacher education, is a senior researcher with the Center. Kathleen Peasley and Constanza Hazelwood, doctoral candidates in teacher education at MSU, are research assistants with the Center. Barbara Lindquist teaches fifth grade and Carol Ligett third grade at an MSU Professional Development School. he authors would like to acknowledge the helpful feedback and support they received from Michael Michell.

students. The learning of 47 fifth graders was studied in three subject matter contexts: science, social studies, and writing.

In this report we examine cases of students' learning from their experiences in our classroom as they studied a U.S. history curriculum organized around concepts that would not only help students understand history but also be powerful in their lives--concepts that we hoped would make our students more human. We also consider ourselves--the teacher-researchers--as learners through the collaborative work we did within the LISSS project. We ask the question, In what ways did our own learning of powerful social studies concepts influence our students' learning?

Through collaborative inquiry into social studies, with the help of the students, our group considered the overarching questions: What is "powerful" social studies? For whom is it powerful? For what purposes is it powerful?

This report will delve into how social studies in this particular context was powerful or not for these particular fifth-grade students--powerful in understanding U.S. history, powerful in text analysis, and powerful in analyzing their own lives. This report is <u>not</u> an attempt to show exemplary practice. Instead, it is an attempt to open up dialogue surrounding the teaching and learning of social issues and social justice in the context of social studies. It is an attempt to portray the messiness of practice, how the ambiguity, uncertainty (Cohen, 1988; Lortie, 1975), and disorder (Finley, 1988) raises important questions about content, knowledge, and pedagogy. This report seeks to provoke all of us to ask the vexing questions of, What is "powerful" social studies? For whom is it powerful? For what purposes is it powerful?

<u>Powerful Social Studies Concepts: Powerful For Whom and For What Purposes?</u>

> Perhaps we should think of American culture as a conversation among different voices. . . . To insist that we "master our own culture" before learning others only defers the vexed question: What gets to count as "our" culture? What makes knowledge worth knowing? (Gates, 1992, p. 175)

> [The current reforms are missing] such questions as: What constitutes really useful knowledge? Whose interests does it serve? What kinds of social relations does it structure and at what price? How does school knowledge enable those who have been generally excluded from schools to speak and act with dignity? (Giroux, 1992, p. 6)

We chose the title, "Powerful Social Studies" because it has a double meaning. First, we found the concepts we used in our fifth-grade classroom powerful in facilitating children's understanding of the multiple perspectives in history. Second, the title uncovers a controversy which exists during this particular historical moment about knowledge construction in the various disciplines, including history. This controversy is whether or not to teach a multicultural rendition of history or a monocultural, i.e., "White western," usually male, canon of history. Questions arise out of this controversy and compel educators to ask, whose history are we teaching in schools? U.S. history is powerful for whom, for those who dominate or those who are dominated? Powerful for what, to dominate or to liberate? As Freire states, "All education is either to domesticate or else to liberate the human spirit" (as cited by Kozol, 1990, p. 15). Therefore, exploring "Powerful Social Studies" will be an exploration of these questions. To what extent were the concepts that framed the history curriculum powerful to students in this liberatory sense?

We took seriously the third principle of The Holmes Group (1990) as expressed in Tomorrow's School's, "against the grain of an unequal society, to make teaching and learning for understanding available for everybody's children" (p. 29, emphasis added). We aspired to go beyond the rhetoric of equity and diversity. In our practice we strove to create a classroom where social studies would challenge students' assumptions that democracy, equality and freedom are and have been assured to all Americans. We wanted to uncover aspects of history that are often hidden in the typical school curriculum, such as the ways in which typical U.S. history curriculum maintains power relations between those who dominate and those who are dominated by failing to reveal and explore unequal power distribution in society. We wanted to develop "curriculum [in U.S. history] that shows the role genuine diversity plays in ensuring a democracy where all voices are heard" (Thomas, 1992).

We chose framing concepts we felt might represent powerful social studies for our students: Perspective, Democracy, Freedom, Liberty, Equality, Justice, Rights/Duties, Racism, Prejudice, Discrimination, Sexism, Exploitation, Power, and Empathy. During the year other concepts naturally evolved, including invisibility, ageism, stereotype (which originated in their science class, see Roth et al., 1992) privilege, and collaboration. These concepts became critical guideposts in the study of U.S. history. We infused the units on Colonization, Westward Expansion/ Conquest, Civil War, and Civil Rights with these concepts. For example, we asked who were exploited during westward expansion (also known as eastern encroachment)?

Instead of teaching history chronologically, we taught it thematically. A guiding central question, however imperfect, that we used across the year to get at the various conflicts throughout history was, What social conflicts continued to fester after colonization which contributed to the outbreak of the Civil War and erupted once again during the Civil Rights era?

The Textbooks of Our Lives

We believe that teaching and learning are "inescapable human" (Dennison, 1969, p. 258) endeavors. Teaching and learning are inextricably linked to who we are as people--our own historicity. Our notion of self may help or hinder the ways in which we view teaching, learning, knowledge, and the learning community. Style (1992) says, "Our lives are worthy textbooks" (p. 68) and should be treated as such. When our lives are read, that is, explored along with all the other resources, powerful curriculum can be created. Yet, teachers and

students are rarely given the opportunity to examine their own lives, to inquire into their own living texts.[3]

Style (1992) goes on to say, "Education needs to enable the student [and teacher] to look through windows into the realities of others, and into mirrors to see his/her own realities reflected back (p. 68)." We tried to give the students in our classroom an opportunity to do so. This report investigates how powerful social studies allowed students to talk about the textbooks of their lives, in and outside of the classroom. We invite all readers to think about how the subject matter they teach can be powerful in helping students to think about their own lives as an integral part of the curriculum they are learning.

Research Approach

Our collaborative relationships in the LISSS Project created new ways of seeing students, classrooms, teaching and learning, and the learning community. Our analysis grows out of this collaborative endeavor that provided multiple insights into the "familiar" context of classrooms. Lather (1991) captures an important aspect of the work that we did as a group: "through dialogue and reflexivity, design, data and theory emerge, with data being recognized as generated from people in a relationship." (p. 72)

In this project we collaborated in teaching and studying two fifth-grade social studies classes. Hasbach and Hoekwater co-planned and co-taught social studies during one school year, while Roth consulted, and Hazelwood documented and consulted with the group (and taught three lessons). Using qualitative methodology, our group investigated the students' developing

---

[3]The living text is one of three overlapping, intersecting, and integrative classroom texts: (1) Academic text includes the resources and curricular materials (e.g., textbook), (2) living text includes the race, class, gender, ethnicity, religion, culture, sexual identity, and historicity of students and teachers, (3) social text includes the rules, norms, social interaction (learning community) intended by the teacher. (Hasbach et al., 1992). These labels are unique to our work, yet the ideas overlap with other researchers' work, for example, Erickson's (1982) model of taught cognitive learning. An addendum needs to be made to this 1992 description in regard to the living text. We have not come across this term in educational writings, yet Hasbach just came across the term used in a novel she encountered in February of 1993, A Revolutionary Woman: A Novel written by Sheila Fugard in 1983. "I envy you this experience, Miss Ransome. Leydon pales in comparison. You talk of a living text, and a real experience." (p. 82)

understanding of social studies concepts, their abilities to take a critical posture towards U.S. history by using these concepts, and their capacities to transfer these concepts to their own lives. The larger group (including Rosaen, Peasley, Linquist, and Ligett) supported our analyses of student learning and our own curricular development efforts in a weekly study group.

Certain premises influenced our[4] vision of social studies: (a) Social issues and conflicts are to a great extent the fabric of social studies, (b) students can assume a stance of critical thinking in relation to social studies content and their own lives; (c) diversity should be affirmed within the social studies curriculum and learning community; and (d) the lives of the students and teachers are "history in the making," and are worthy of being "read" along with all the other resources. We used these core ideas to frame the U.S. history content.

In this report you will hear many voices: the students' voices, the voices of the teacher-researchers, and the voices of well known and not-so-well known theorists and thinkers. We want this report to be in content and in form multivoiced. Over the past three years we attempted to hear multiple perspectives and to make sense of those perspectives in the context of social studies. In our writing we aspire to do the same. In traditional educational research the tendency is not to use extensive quotes and excerpts from other sources; instead the practice is to paraphrase and condense.[5] Yet, in this writing we want the original authors' voices to be heard. In her educational writing (Lather, 1991) states that her "accumulation of quotes,

---

[4]The term "our" and "we" refers to the authors of the paper. When the discussion centers around the teachers, teachers will be identified by name.

[5]Rodriguez (1982) speaks to this "professional writing" that we are trying to avoid:

> Meanwhile my file cards accumulated. A professional, I knew exactly how to search a book for pertinent information. I could quickly assess and summarize the usability of the many books I consulted. But whenever I started to write, I knew too much (and not enough) to be able to write anything but sentences that were overly cautious, timid, strained brittle under the heavy weight of footnotes and qualifications. I seemed unable to dare a passionate statement. I felt drawn by professionalism to the edge of sterility, capable of no more than pedantic, lifeless, unassailable prose. (pp. 70-71)

excerpts . . . is . . . an effort to be `multivoiced,' to weave varied speaking voices together as opposed to putting forth a singular `authorative' voice'" (p. 9). We have tried to do the same.

Context of the Study and Data Sources

The 47 fifth graders (22 in one class and 25 in the other) are predominantly White[6], but included two African American students, three Mexican American students, and two students of Native American descent. The students come predominantly from working class or poor families. A large number of the students lived in a nearby trailer park. Many of the students' parents had not completed high school. Jarvis is a conservative, bedroom community, located near a midsize city and a large university. Emerson Elementary is considered to have the highest number of "at-risk" students of any of the five elementary schools in the district.[7]

In the context of social studies, group and individual in-depth interviews were conducted to assess students' ways of making sense of the central concepts taught in the context of the U.S. history curriculum. Ten students were targeted for in-depth individual interviews across the year and at the end of the year. By looking at the students' understandings of social studies concepts, we gained insights into ways in which students constructed meaning in this subject matter. We chose both students who we predicted would be comfortable with answering interview questions and students who we thought would have difficulty in answering the questions. We made these assumptions based on in-class behaviors, but these assumptions were to be challenged by the students' responses in the interviews. We also made sure that our targeted group included students of color and students who were both academically strong and academically struggling.

---

[6]We have chosen to use the term "White" and capitalize it as Nieto (1992) suggests:

> You will notice that the terms White and Black, when used, are capitalized. I have chosen to do so because they refer to groups of people. . . . As such, they deserve to be capitalized. Although these are not the scientific terms for race, terms such as Negroid and Caucasian are no longer used in everyday speech or are rejected by he people to whom they refer. These more commonly used words, then, should be treated as the terms of preference. (p. 17)

[7]Names of the community, school, and students are pseudonyms; names of teachers are actual.

The student interviews were powerful in enabling us to illustrate student understanding of the framing concepts. The interviews revealed the extent to which the concepts helped students gain an understanding of U.S. history through multiple perspectives and how the concepts may have helped to bridge critical social issues from the past with those of pressing concern in contemporary society, as well as their own realities. We emphasize interviews, for as Zavarzadeh and Morton state, the power of interviews is that they "affirm the belief that people contain knowledge" (cited in Lather, 1991, p. 113). We tried to leave the interview questions open-ended, for example, "Are there things you know now about history that you didn't at the beginning of the year?" so that the children could talk about their own themes and lives, co-constructing the interviews in ways that made sense to them. In the interviews they told us things that we had not anticipated, making connections that we had not foreseen. They talked about the textbooks of their lives.

In this report you will meet eight students through their in-depth individual interviews and four more students through their participation in the classroom discourse. In addition to our use of interviewing, we investigated their understandings of social studies concepts by analyzing their writing, our classroom fieldnotes, and audiotapes of their group work. Classroom activities often resulted in the creation of student talk and writing that helped trace students' unfolding understanding. For example, early in the year we had students brainstorm in groups how they would define the concepts we had chosen as frameworks. We compared students' initial understandings as revealed in this classroom activity to their developing understandings of these concepts through in-depth midway and end-of-year interviews. We continued to analyze classroom discourse across the year, examining how it revealed students' developing understandings of the concepts and their willingness to discuss them freely.

This report describes findings from the second year of our work together. We present examples from classroom discourse and from student interviews to help the reader see the bridge between the concepts in action in the classroom and the concepts the students internalized. We searched themes that revealed whether or not the concepts had been powerful

in the students' understanding of U.S. history and their own lives. We were especially interested in the ways in which the students used the framing concepts to talk about what they were learning in social studies. We wanted to uncover discrepant cases, that is, students who were not powerfully affected by social studies, in order to investigate the factors which mitigated against deep conceptual understanding of the framing concepts.

Theoretical Frameworks

We were influenced by two theoretical frameworks: a conceptual change framework (Posner, Strike, Hewson & Gertzog, 1982; Roth, 1989, 1989-90) and McIntosh's (1983, 1990) Phase theory. In this section we describe how these frameworks guided our pedagogy and curriculum choices (as well as our analysis of student learning). Our discussion of our goal in restructuring our pedagogy is followed by a consideration of the controversy which exists in social education today.

An essential aspect of the conceptual change framework for us was that teachers need to focus on learners--their ways of thinking and making sense of social studies content and their needs for support in developing understandings. This theory posits that it is necessary to elicit students' knowledge, ideas, beliefs, confusions, conceptions, and experiences in order to surface their prior knowledge, then challenge them to revisit and reconsider their ideas in light of new information. The framework helped us decide which concepts to focus on in terms of meaningfulness to students' lives. It also shaped our vision of the nature of learning, that it is evolutionary and happens over time, and that success is determined by individual change and growth versus all students ending up in the same place. Yet, we found this paradigm lacking in and of itself, for it did not unmask the power inherent in knowledge--for example, whose knowledge is being "understood"? Who is visible in the knowledge generation and construction? Who is invisible? For a more complete understanding of the exclusive, nature of many disciplines, including history, (for example, that it is usually White, privileged males who are highlighted in the "march of history" [Brown, Hasbach, Hong, Peay, & Mirriam, 1991]) we turned to McIntosh.

McIntosh's (1983, 1990) Phase theory influenced us in terms of articulating what an exclusive curriculum looked like and how to create an inclusive curriculum. McIntosh's phases represent the developmental history of curriculum construction that seems to parallel educators' development as they learn more about who has been excluded from history. McIntosh describes the potential changes in curriculum in terms of Phases in which history has been portrayed as follows:

Phase 1: All white male history.

Phase 2: Exceptional minority and women individuals in history

Phase 3: Minority issues and women's issues as problems, anomalies, absences or victims in history.

Phase 4: The lives and culture of women and people of color everywhere AS history.

Phase 5: History redefined and reconstructed to include us All.

We aspired to developing a Phase 4 curriculum since a Phase 5 curriculum, according to McIntosh and we agree, requires that the entire culture be reconstructed. We wanted the students to be able to challenge the traditional views of U.S. history and be able to see the ways in which history needs to be about the fabric and people of everyday life, as well as about "famous" people. [8]

McIntosh's Phase theory gave us the theoretical tools we needed to understand the ways in which knowledge is usually created and conveyed in most classrooms, in either a Phase 1, 2, or 3 manner. We were attempting to move from bits and pieces of Phases 1-3 to Phase 4, and we chose concepts that looked at the ways in which African Americans, women, Native Americans, and Hispanics were often "invisible" in traditional social studies. Some of the concepts we used that dealt with the absences and victimization of these groups were: Power, Racism, Sexism, Ageism, Exploitation, Prejudice, Invisibility, and Discrimination. We did not limit our

[8]For a more detailed analysis of Phase theory see Hasbach et al., 1992.

discussion about women and people of color[9] to those who did "famous" things, but pursued an understanding of what the lives of "ordinary" people were like.

In our classroom, we tried to present women and people of color not simply as "have nots," as mere victims, but also as "haves" who survived and have been an important part of creating the fabric of everyday life despite great odds. Even though we aspired to a Phase 4 curriculum, too often we found ourselves stuck in a Phase 2 or Phase 3 curriculum. For example, we often highlighted the accomplishments of great women of color, for example Harriet Tubman, without delving into all the others who helped her in the fight to emancipate enslaved Africans. This lack of pursuing the collective struggles of various groups for their own emancipation is in part a result of the materials which we had available to us, that is, materials which tended to feature persons who were "individually" heroic[10]. Our students, however, seemed to gravitate toward a Phase 4 conception of social studies.

Restructuring "Inside Our Heads" About What and How to Teach

From reading conceptual change theory, and phase theory, we realized that we had to "restructure inside our heads" (Brown 1991), and begin to think about curriculum and pedagogy differently. It was not enough just to "deliver up" a revisioned curriculum: instead our practice had to be different also. For us, "pedagogy itself [had to] be a text" (Ulmer, as cited in Lather, 1991, p. 125) that was read differently.

---

[9]This term is used instead of minority. When we think of a global community the term "minority" seems oddly ethnocentric, and can be viewed as offensive. The term people of color is preferable, although not without its own problems. Nieto (1992) states:

> Minority is a misnomer. It is never used to describe, for example, Swedish Americans, Albanian Americans, or Dutch Americans. Yet strictly speaking, these groups, being a numerical minority in our society , should also be referred to as such. The term has historically been used only to refer to racial minorities, thus implying a status less than that accorded to other groups. . . . Although people of color is accepted and used by a growing number of African Americans, Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans, it, too, is problematic. It implies, for example, that Whites are somehow colorless; it also negates the racial mixing that is a reality among every ethnic group. . . . Nevertheless, it is at this historical moment probably the most appropriate term and preferable to the others that are available. . . . It is a term that emerged from these communities themselves. (p. 17-18)

[10]It is important to note that those who create trade books and other resources are themselves products of an educational system that promoted a Phase 1, or 2, curriculum.

Freire (1985/1986) helped us read pedagogy differently. His depiction of traditional pedagogy as the "banking method" suggested for us an alternative portrait of pedagogy. He delineates the banking method by contrasting the roles of teacher and student:

Table 1

The Banking Method

(a) the teacher teaches and the students are taught;
(b) the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing;
(c) the teacher thinks and the students are thought about;
(d) the teacher talks and the students listen--meekly;
(e) the teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined;
(f) the teachers chooses and enforces his [her] choice, and the students comply;
(g) the teacher acts and the students have the illusion of acting through the action of the teacher;
(h) the teacher chooses the program content, and the students (who were not consulted) adapt to it;
(i) the teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his [her] own professional authority, which he [she] sets in opposition to the freedom of the students;
(j) the teacher is the subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere objects. (p. 59)

In contrast with Freire' s banking method of transmitting knowledge, and in keeping with a Phase 4 curriculum, we saw our roles as teachers and students as dialectical and reflexive. We generated our own list to represent our restructured pedagogy.

Table 2

Restructured Pedagogy

(a) the teacher teaches and learns and the students teach and learn;
(b) the teacher and the students know something and both have much more to learn;
(c) the teacher and the students think about many things and share those thoughts in the learning community;
(d) the teacher talks and listens and the students talk and listen, the teacher tries to limit the amount of teacher talk and frontal teaching;
(e) discipline is managed to a large extent by the teacher and students being engaged in the learning process;
(f) the teacher and students jointly construct the ways in which the discourse of the classroom and the curriculum will evolve;
(g) the teacher and the students are agents of action, there is a reciprocal and co-constructed action in the classroom;
(h) the teacher and the students choose the program content, the teacher being aware that students mediate, oppose, resist, and re-create the program even if not given an overt role in the choosing of content: students are not passive receptacles;

(i) the teacher recognizes that within the present authority structure that she/he can choose to use her/his professional and knowledge authority to help liberate or domesticate students' thinking;
(j) the teacher and students are both the subjects of the learning process, neither are objectified and become the "other."

Learning to act on these principles on a daily basis was as challenging as conceiving of a Phase 4 curriculum in the first place, and we learned a great deal from our students along the way.

Beyond Restructured Pedagogy: An Antibias Curriculum

Beyond this restructured pedagogy, we also saw ourselves as trying to teach an antibias curriculum. We wanted to construct a curriculum that would deal explicitly with issues of oppression and bias throughout our exploration of U.S. history. We realized that children of color, especially poor children of color are often invisible in the curriculum and are the targets of racism (see Moraga & Anzaldua, 1983). Often White teachers do little about this, perhaps because they have not been trained to deal with issues of diversity and equity (see Zeichner, in press). Rarely do children of color experience a pedagogy of liberation as hooks (1989) so lovingly recalls:

> Her work was a pedagogy of liberation ... one that would address and confront our realities ... children growing up within a white-supremacist culture. Miss Moore knew that if we were to be fully self-realized, then her work, and the work of all of our progressive teachers, was not to teach us solely the knowledge in books, but to teach us an oppositional world view--different from that of our exploiters and oppressors, a world view that would enable us to see ourselves not through the lens of racism or racist stereotypes but one that would enable us to focus clearly and succinctly, to look at ourselves, at the world around us, critically--analytically--to see ourselves first and foremost as striving for wholeness, for unity of heart, mind, and spirit. (p. 49)

We wanted the children of color in our class to hear an "oppositional world view." We also wanted all the children to take responsibility for their own role in the perpetuation of discrimination, each realizing that they are part of the problem as well as part of the solution.

The Controversy Over What to Teach

While McIntosh deals with the exclusive versus inclusive nature of the curriculum, and Freire deals with the pedagogical implications for a teacher who values students' experiences and knowledge, there are theorists who stridently condemn the existing educational conditions in terms of content. They articulate the controversy in polemic terms, making it possible for

educators to see how volatile and emotion-laden the controversy over what to teach can be. History teachers, as well as teachers in other disciplines, need to be aware that there is conflict over how and what to teach, making thoughtful reflection and deliberate action even more critical on their part. We wanted to be thoughtful about the U.S. history curriculum and deliberate in our teaching of it. Theorists like hooks (1989) and Hirsch (1987) are polar opposites. For example, hooks states that the content of U.S. history promotes White supremacy.

> Recently in a conversation with a white male lawyer at his home where I was a guest, he informed me that someone had commented to him that children are learning very little history these days in school, that the attempt to be all-inclusive, to talk about Native Americans, blacks, women, etc. has led to a fragmented focus on particular representative individuals with no larger historical framework. I responded . . . that it is easier to change the focus from Christopher Columbus, the important white man who "discovered" America, to Sitting Bull or Harriet Tubman, than to cease telling a distorted version of U.S. history which upholds white supremacy. Really teaching history in a new way would require abandoning the old myths informed by white supremacy like the notion that Columbus discovered America. It would mean talking about imperialism, colonization, about the Africans who came here before Columbus. . . . It would mean talking about genocide, about the white colonizers' exploitation and betrayal of Native American Indians; about ways the legal and governmental structures of this society from the Constitution on supported and upheld slavery, apartheid. . . . This history can be taught only when the perspective of teachers are no longer shaped by white supremacy. (pp. 114-115)

We did not want to teach a distorted version of U.S. history, instead we wanted to teach a version that honored those who had been silenced and oppressed throughout history. Yet, those of us who want to challenge White supremacy are faced with reformists who declare that mainstream culture is not racist, or exclusive in any way. As vocal and sharp as hooks are the proponents of "cultural literacy." For example, Hirsch (1987) states:

> Why have our schools failed to fulfill their fundamental acculturative responsibility? . . . We have permitted school policies that have shrunk the body of information that Americans share, and these policies have caused our national literacy to decline. . . . Objectors have said that traditional materials are class-bound, white, Anglo-Saxon, and Protestant, not to mention racist, sexist, and excessively Western. . . . Although mainstream culture is tied to the written word and may therefore seem more formal and elitist than other elements of culture, that is an illusion. Literate culture is the most democratic culture in our land: it excludes nobody; it cuts across generations and social groups and classes. . . . We should teach our children current mainstream culture. . . . Children need to understand elements of our literary and mythic heritage that are often alluded to

> without explanation, for example, Adam and Eve . . . Cinderella . . . Robin Hood . . . Ten Commandments, and Tweedledum and Tweedledee. (pp. 18-30)

These theorists implicitly illustrate the dilemmas created for teachers who are trying to teach with equity and diversity in mind. We were committed to careful examination of the issues of equity and diversity, realizing that we were choosing a position that is not necessarily popular.

Beyond Demographics--Accountability

Our reason to pursue a more inclusive and multicultural curriculum went beyond the present-day argument of changing demographics, that is, people of color are becoming the majority in many areas (see Banks, 1991-1992; Thomas, 1992). This argument asserts that with the changing "demographics, [diversity] has nothing to do with preference [anymore], it has to do with structural reality" (Thomas, 1992). We asked curselves, "It's more than that, isn't it?" As educators we should want to provide a curriculum that mirrors all students' realities not out of fear--that the "minority" will become a majority soon, but because we feel it is the right thing to do, it is just. All students have a right to be mirrored in school curricula and a multicultural curriculum should be constructed out of a good heart, out of the desire to be inclusive, out of the desire for social justice, not only out of pragmatism and fear.

While the flurry of current reforms rage around us (see Giroux, 1992), we are poignantly aware that the issues that we believe are at the heart of education are often ignored and avoided: making our students more human and able to become change agents in their own lifetime. Accountability of teachers and students is reduced to paper and pencil indicators of achievement and success; nowhere is there an indicator of whether these students have the ability to analyze the world around them, to recognize injustices, and to become active in making the world a better place. As Giroux states:

> Accountability in current mainstream discourse offers no insights into how schools should prepare students to push against the oppressive boundaries of gender, class, race, and age domination. Nor does such a language provide the conditions for students to interrogate the curriculum as a text deeply implicated in issues and struggles concerning self-identity, culture, power, and history. (p. 7)

We strove to foster in our students the ability and disposition to think about their place in the scheme of things, in the "march of history," and ask themselves: What about those who are invisible? What about those who have little or no power? What about racism, sexism, exploitation, and discrimination? What about me in all of this?

Our goal was to have the students realize that to understand deeply any historical event, they must be able to see it from a multiplicity of vantage points. Textbooks not only present white-washed and sanitized depictions of people and events (see Bigelow, 1989, 1992; Kozol, 1990, Nieto, 1992), but represent a White Western vantage point.[11] Our aim was to create a curriculum that used "selected content as a vehicle for developing in students an unwillingness to accept glib, unwarranted answers from any source" (Wiggins, 1989, p. 57).

We examined with the students the question of whether and how the typical curriculum enables the "winners" to speak while the "losers" are silenced. As Nieto (1992) states, in the typical curriculum

> Students learn that . . . the United States was involved in a heroic westward expansion . . . that enslaved Africans were freed by the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863. . . . History, as we know, is generally written by the conquerors, not by the vanquished or by those who benefit least in society. The result is history books skewed in the direction of those who are dominant in society. If Indian people were to write the history books . . . that there was no heroic westward expansion but rather an eastern encroachment. . . . African Americans would describe the active participation of enslaved Africans in their own liberation. (p. 220)

In our curriculum, if we wanted the vanquished groups to be heard, we needed to examine whose voices drowned them out and find ways to make history multivoiced.

The Teachers and the Concepts

In this section we describe our intentions as teachers in planning and teaching in this classroom, emphasizing our own learning about powerful social studies concepts. We describe ourselves and how our experiences together over a two-year period challenged our thinking about the social studies curriculum. Our experiences in the LISSS Project had a profound impact on our thinking about social studies curriculum and about which concepts should serve

---

[11] See Hasbach et al., (1992) for an exploration of the social studies textbook's White perspective.

as the core of a "powerful" social studies curriculum. In our weekly study group meetings, we drew from each other's knowledge and expertise as well as from a broad research literature to challenge our thinking about what was most important to teach: How can we teach for genuine understanding in social studies? What is most important for students to understand? How do we need to change teaching practice to enable such understandings to develop in children and in prospective teachers?

Hasbach, whose doctoral program includes a cognate in feminist scholarship and pedagogy, brought to the group an expertise and long-held commitment to understanding and implementing equity issues in education. Roth brought a knowledge of modes of inquiry and knowledge change in science along with a curiosity about parallels and differences between scientific inquiry and historical inquiry. Hoekwater brought a knowledge of the events and chronology of U.S. history, and a knowledge of fifth-graders' developmental abilities. Hazelwood brought a knowledge about the social context of science classrooms and a curiosity about how social context would play out in a social studies classroom. Rosaen brought an expertise and interest in the relationship of writing and literature to the learning of important social studies concepts. Peasley brought a knowledge and interest in the relationship of writing and discourse to subject matter learning. Linquist brought a knowledge of language arts and a knowledge of fifth-graders' developmental ability in writing. And Ligett brought an interest and knowledge of communication arts on the third-grade level as well as an intense interest in thinking about her own social studies teaching.

Politically and philosophically, we represented a range of positions and values. One member had grown up in a family of civil rights activists, living and working in a neighborhood in Washington, DC that had changed from an all-White to a mostly Black neighborhood in a time of civil rights turmoil. One member had grown up in Colombia, South America, and had not experienced being "a person of color, a `minority'" until she came to the United States. Most of us had grown up in middle-class, White, conservative midwestern towns, insulated from encountering diversity in our everyday lives. Hasbach, as seen by the others in the group,

represented the most revolutionary position; she taught college classes and led a yearlong SEED (Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity) seminar for teachers that challenged individuals to confront their own racial, gender, and class biases. Many LISSS colleagues participated in these monthly SEED seminars which served as a place to examine ourselves and our beliefs.

In addition to our shared experiences in the LISSS study group and in the SEED seminar, we also shared a teacher education experience, planning and teaching a methods of teaching social studies course for prospective elementary teachers. In this context we drew from our readings and discussions in our study group and from our personal growth experiences in the SEED seminars to restructure the curriculum and organization of the course, designing ways to promote significant change in prospective teachers' thinking about the importance of social studies teaching (see Roth, et. al., 1992). We struggled to find ways to help these undergraduates connect with ideas discussed in pieces we had found so provocative, such as Bigelow (1989), Kozol (1990), McIntosh (1983, 1990), and others.

While we brought different values, knowledge, and interests to these collaborative activities, we were seemingly homogeneous in other respects. In particular, all but one of our group who was Colombian, were White women and we were teaching mostly White students (both in the elementary and teacher education classrooms). We had to confront this as we strove to teach with equity and diversity in mind.

This was a struggle for us; grappling with how not to be White supremacists, all the while sealed within our White[12] skin, and how to show competing perspectives. Given that we are White teachers, we realize our perspectives are bounded by what McIntosh (1988) calls White privilege. She talks about the dilemma of White privilege by saying that she was

---

[12]We ascribe to the theory that all the social constructs of who we are affect our ways of knowing (see Belenky et al., [1986]) and our ways of seeing the world. We agree with Gannett (1992) when she says:

> It is important to acknowledge the critical insight that . . . race, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religion are . . . important determinants in the social construction of the self. . . . [Also] gender as a social construct powerfully writes itself onto all of our lives and we must try to decipher its inscriptions . . . (p. 11)

> taught to recognize racism only in individual acts of meanness by members of my [White] group, never in invisible systems conferring unsought racial dominance on my group from birth . . . the obliviousness of white advantage . . . is kept strongly enculturated in the United States so as to maintain the myth of meritocracy. (p. 18-19)

McIntosh explains that simply because of having White skin, Whites are afforded certain unearned advantages, and privileges. These privileges are as "simple" as the "flesh color" crayon that matches more closely Whites, to maps of the world where the primarily White countries are larger in appearance than those countries where primarily people of color reside[13]. When White advantage is rarely addressed in curricula, schools are complicit in perpetuating the myth of meritocracy. We wanted to address this racial dominance in our classroom, yet, we realized the task was formidable.

White privilege, combined with teaching/research and lay communities that often advocate teaching as a "neutral" and "detached" enterprise, makes teaching social studies from a critical perspective difficult at the present time. However, we reject the notion that the work of a teacher can be detached and objective. Namenwirth states, "Scientists [and social scientists] firmly believe that as long as they are not conscious of any bias or political agenda, they are neutral and objective, when in fact they are only unconscious" (as cited in Lather, 1991, p. 106). As a group we came to recognize that teaching <u>is</u> a political act. We learned to help each other recognize our biases in our curriculum and pedagogy. We took the position in our classroom that hooks (1989) does:

> The work of any teacher committed to the full self-realization of students was necessarily and fundamentally radical, that ideas were not neutral, that to teach in a way that liberates, that expands consciousness, that awakens, is to challenge domination at it very core. (p. 50)

Our willingness to challenge this domination and White privilege among ourselves enabled us to think more deeply about how to challenge domination with our fifth graders and prospective teachers.

---

[13]Crayola crayons has recently come out with a multicultural pack where the crayons have the "flesh tones" of many peoples of the world. A map which represents the world more accurately would be "Peters projection" which is a world map in equal area presentation.

Restructuring Inside Our Hearts as Well as Our Heads

> "But now," says the Once-ler,
> "Now that you're here,
> the word of the Lorax seems perfectly clear,
> UNLESS someone like you
> cares a whole awful lot,
> nothing is going to get better.
> It's not. (Seuss, 1971, p. 58)

Our work together on these issues often became quite emotional. We helped each other through our feelings of anger, bitterness, rage, sadness, and guilt. As we did so, we came to realize how powerful--both intellectually and emotionally--certain concepts had become for us. Our ideas about democracy, justice, freedom, and history--the core of traditional social studies curriculum--were deepened by our consideration of concepts like diversity, empathy, racism, sexism, power, exploitation, privilege, and prejudice. As we struggled ourselves to integrate these concepts with the view of the world we had been taught, we became angry at the whitewashed vision of the world we had received. We resented being treated as "innocents," instead of being empowered to become change agents. As we worked through these dilemmas, we identified two central aspects of our teaching that we wanted to change.

First, we realized the importance of restructuring within our hearts as well as our heads. Too often change is thought about merely in intellectual terms, often missing the mark. In the curriculum revisioning we are talking about, if the heart does not follow, little is accomplished. It seems to us that is how so many educators on all levels fall into the trap of "talking the talk but not walking the walk." Unless we feel differently, all the "intellectual" changes will remain just that, intellectual. It is easy to intellectualize about the changes in teaching and learning, but unless it is deeply felt, change will not happen. Change is a personal endeavor and the truism that the "personal is political" (Hanisch, as cited in Humm, 1990, p. 162) can be turned around as Steinem (1992) suggests, that the "political is personal" (p.17). We need to be stretched both intellectually and emotionally. Our intellect and passion need to meld, otherwise it is all "academic," and little will change for our students, ourselves, and the society in which we all live.

Part of how we restructured inside our heads and hearts was that we really listened to children in ways that we had not done before. Giroux (1992) reminds us that students need to be

> exposed to a language of historical perspective. By perspective I mean the awareness that the way things are is not the way they have always been or must necessarily be in the future. To have perspective is to link historical inquiry to the imperatives of moral and political agency; it is to locate ourselves and our visions inside the language of history and possibility. History in this sense does not become something to be discovered, part of the search for an ultimate referent. Instead, it suggests the process of what might be called an imaginative rediscovery. Understood in these terms, history provides multiple referents, codes, voices and languages and suggests that in the intersection between the past and the present one recognizes a future that offers few guarantees, but is open to dialogue, negotiation, and translation; hence a future becomes more accessible and imaginable. (pp. 9-10)

Secondly, we wanted the curriculum to enable students to become active as citizens and change agents. To do this we believed we could no longer whitewash U.S. history. Students were more likely to become committed to civic action if they understood history richly, from multiple perspectives, and if they felt some commitment to change based on their anger or discomfort with what has been.

We believe that it is essential to go beyond a eurocentric curriculum. If we are "living on the planet [we need to believe that] diversity is important" and that we are "irresponsible if [we are] not taking diversity seriously" (Thomas, 1992). We knew that the rhetoric of diversity and equity is accepted by many theorists and practitioners, but once actual students are taught differently, for example, that White people[14] had a hand in the oppression of others, e.g., the Trail of Tears, people become very uncomfortable. Yet, we decided to go beyond the rhetoric and actually try to teach students differently: Show them multiple perspectives--not only the White Western perspective. Show them the atrocities as well as the glories of history. Show them perspectives of history that are not whitewashed and sanitized. Show them perspectives which will allow them to see the mistakes we as a nation have made in the past (as

---

[14]We are not saying that only White people have had a hand in the oppression of others, yet we were focusing on this group, Whites, who held most of the power during this time period. The oppression of one group by another is contextual in nature and has to do with who holds power and who does not within a particular historical and cultural framework.

well as the accomplishments), so that they realize they are history-in-the-making, and their lives can make a difference in terms of equity and social justice.

The Classroom: Teachers and Students Enacting the Concepts

In this section you will see the concepts in action. These are classroom clips that illustrate the students and the teachers interacting with the concepts in social studies. This section will help show how the classroom discourse concentrated on the social studies concepts, showing how Hasbach and Hoekwater tried to link discussions on multiple topics in U.S. history to the critical concepts.

Classroom Clip One--Social Studies as a Content Area: Social Studies Is "Capitals of States and Stuff" and "I Don't Think I'm Ever Going to Forget What Discrimination Means."

In this classroom clip, the students reveal their initial conceptions of what it means to study social studies. Our concepts helped them redefine social studies to include more than capitals of states. Hasbach and Hoekwater had explicit discussions about the use of these concepts and why they might relate to social studies. On this day, the concept of discrimination was discussed. Hoekwater brought up the question about whether the concepts we were using did relate to social studies or not. In this excerpt, Billy reveals a narrow conception of what social studies as a content area means, and Brenda speaks to how she has internalized the concept of discrimination. (Underlined text is to draw the reader's attention to those critical lines.)

Hoekwater: Do you think everything we've been doing for the past month, since this is a social studies class, do you think this is all part of social studies?

Billy: No.

Hoekwater: Why do you say no Billy? Do you think that we have not been teaching you social studies?

Billy: Like in all the other great (inaudible). All these chapters on racism and stuff, we'd be learning these in reading. We would learn our new words in reading. We would learn about things like the capitals of states and stuff in social studies instead of this.

Hasbach: But do you think that, you know those terms that we've been really going into a lot, like racism and stuff, do you think that has an impact on history? Do you

think that it affects the history and it affects our time right now, history-in-the-making? Billy, do you think that?[15]

Billy: Yes.

Hasbach: Would that be important to know not only in reading but also in history? Or do you think it's like in the textbook for example, they have words like democracy. So they have a list of terms that are important, but what I'm hearing you say is that those terms or those ideas, if you read about them in something like reading that's enough rather than having them part of social studies?

Billy: No, I've always learned new words and their meanings in reading.

Hasbach: So you're saying that it's sort of unusual to learn new words in social studies? [Billy nods] Okay. [Calling on Brenda who has her hand raised] Brenda?

Brenda: I like learning it more in social studies because you learn more about the words than we would in reading and looking it up in the dictionary. Now we get to write about it and talk about it instead of just having to put the words on paper in vocabulary. When you talk about the words like we are now, if you talk about it for such a long time, I mean, I don't think I'm ever going to forget what discrimination means. I like talking about it for a long time. I don't like just saying, "Oh well that what's what that means, okay," I like talking about words for a long period.

Both Brenda and Billy saw our class discussions as skill and vocabulary development, something they were not used to doing in social studies. Timmy shifted the conversation by thinking about how the students might use their understandings of the concepts to interpret historical accounts in new ways:

Hasbach: You know what the other class suggested? They want a reunion and they want to see if they remember what discrimination means after a while. They want to come back and see if in 10 years they remember this lesson. Because that's a question I've asked, if they think that they would remember it better.

Timmy: And looking up words in the dictionary and writing them on paper is a lot more boring than sitting here and discussing it in class.

Hoekwater: Why do you suppose we spent so much time on them? I've got all this stuff up around the room about colonization and what's meant by colonization and I mentioned earlier that we were going to get into this, but gosh, we haven't used our books. We've just been going through all these terms. Why do you suppose it's been so important before we start studying history? Has this been wasted time? [Hoekwater calls on Timmy who has his hand raised] Tim?

---

[15]Hasbach gave Billy little option but to agree with her. Often we do not realize how close-ended our questions to children are until we "see" the questions we ask on transcripts. This has an implication for teachers doing research on their own teaching. Often teachers cannot have transcripts done of their teaching, but even audio or videotaping lessons helps us discover the ways in which we shut down dialogue and ways in which we can open it up.

Timmy: I think it has something to do with colonization. Because when Captain Newport brought them men over here, he was taking land away from the Indians.

Hasbach: And so if you say that it has a connection with what we've been doing, what do you think the connection would be? Would that fit in with the terms we've just been viewing? It will really fit into something that we're going to go over a little later.

Hoekwater: Can you think of any one of these terms that might fit in there?

Timmy: Discrimination.

Hasbach: Okay. I think you're absolutely right and I think discrimination would fit. They discriminated against the people that were here.

Timmy: The Indians.

Later on in the class discussion Billy raises his hand and is called on.

Billy: I think the reason we have taken so much time on these words is you couldn't really learn about colonization without knowing what all these words mean and when you talk about colonization and you use all these words we wouldn't really know what you meant. We wouldn't learn from it unless we knew what these words meant.

It seems that some students, like Billy, have a fixed vision of what learning social studies entails, "capitals of states and stuff." They do not see learning about social issues as being an important part of social studies. What does this say about the way in which social studies is taught in the elementary classroom--is it devoid of social issues? This focus on social issues was new for Billy and others, and challenged their notions of what counts as valid knowledge in social studies. However, Brenda enjoyed the discussions around the concepts and had begun to see ways in which they could use the concepts to understand history. Billy later on seemed to see the relevance of learning these concepts. Yet, we wondered if he was saying this because he knew this is what the teachers wanted to hear? We thought of Billy, from various behaviors, as a school competent child (Mehan, 1980), knowing what to do to excel. Had he figured out what he needed to say to win the teachers' approval? (Later on we will hear that Billy can define and explain empathy, but he doesn't practice what he declares he has learned.) Had he begun to genuinely see the value of learning these concepts? Or did Hasbach and Hoekwater misinterpret his original statements? Was he just saying this type of social studies

was different than what he was used to? Or did he still believe that the concepts weren't the real "stuff" of social studies?

Toward the end of the same lesson, after discussing discrimination in relation to the American Indians' plight during colonization, both Hasbach and Hoekwater explicitly talk about the connection of the concepts, discrimination, racism, sexism, and duty, to social studies and the students' own lives, suggesting that unless they are part of the solution, they are part of the problem. For example, Hasbach took time to point out to students ways in which they were connecting the concept of discrimination to their lives and tried to show that in this classroom connections like that were valued:

Hasbach: You know, it's part of our history as Americans that we have to live with. As young people, and not so young people, we all need to learn about these things so that we don't keep these problems alive. Have you ever heard the idea that if you are not part of the solution, you're part of the problem? [Children shake their head no.] It's the idea that if we don't learn about these things and try to make changes then we're as much a part of the problem as we can be the solution. I guess what we're trying to say in all this is that when we're learning these terms, those are going to be important in every unit we do in social studies. We're going to be trying to look for these things [concepts] in the books we read and in the textbooks, and when we talk about history so that you can identify these ideas when we go through the various units. I guess what I think is so interesting is that when I read your journals, I saw you making real interesting connections to your own life and to all sorts of things. And I think that's what you want to keep on doing. When we read things in history or we're doing certain work in social studies, that you connect it to your own life and see how you are part of history. You are history-in-the-making. You can be part of the solution and you can be part of the problem.

Hoekwater pushed a step further, by emphasizing ways in which students' insights gained from seeing the film, "A Class Divided," could influence and guide their future behavior.

Hoekwater: I just want to ask you another question in the sense that with this movie that you saw ["A Class Divided"] and with all our talk on discrimination and racism and sexism, do you think you as a person can help change things? I mean this goes on every day. This goes on outside on the playground, inside the classroom. This goes on outside after school, whether it's in the form of a fight or whatever. I hear people saying, "People are writing things about me that aren't nice." How can we stop, we need to stop these kind of things. And while you're in elementary school here at Emerson, a lot of you people have known each other since the first grade and I think we're pretty understanding and accepting of each other, in the sense that we're all different. I think the movie, as I read your journals, made many of us aware of some discriminatory comments or things that we have thought about other people. I don't want it to end right here today, I don't want it to end thinking that this is all over because next year, you're all going to be

> separated, you're going to meet a lot on new kids and friends and you're going to hear a lot of people say mean things about some of your friends that you've grown up here at Emerson with. I think you need to understand that it's your duty as well as your right to comment back to people on whether it's just, "That isn't a nice thing for you to say about that person because that hurts me when you're saying that about them."

Hasbach and Hoekwater took an active stand that the children's behavior in social studies had ramifications for how they behaved in multiple settings. Taking this stance stands in contrast to the "cultural literacy" approach to teaching where students are encouraged to receive knowledge (see Belenky et al., 1986). In this classroom students were encouraged to construct knowledge (see Belenky et al., 1986) and use it in their daily lives. The students made many connections in their journal writings to the ways in which they had discriminated against others. In their writing they seemed to indicate they saw connections between what they learned in the classroom and life outside it. We tried to convey to the children that they are history-in-the-making and that they construct history daily inside and outside of the classroom. Hoekwater's remarks to the students were intended to show students how their lives intertwined with history: "The fifth grader who pushes little kids off the slide makes social studies curriculum" ("Maybe the White Men," 1992, p. 3).

Classroom Clip Two--Learning to Take a Critical Stance: "I Would Probably Trust This Book More Than Our Textbooks."

> The subtext of the assignment is to teach students that text material, indeed all material, is to be read skeptically. I want students to explore the politics of print, that perspectives on history and social reality underlie the written word and that to read is both to comprehend what is written, but also to question why it is written. My intention is not to encourage an "I-don't-believe-anything-" cynicism, but rather to equip students to bring a writer's assumptions and values to the surface so students can decide what is useful and what is not in any particular work. (Bigelow, 1989, p. 640)

We tried to be explicit about not creating a cynical outlook on various sources, but rather learn to take a critical stance toward text by looking at the author's perspective and assumptions. Hasbach, Hoekwater, and Hazelwood were teaching when a discussion arose about which is the "better" perspective. We began to see that our students were interpreting taking a

critical stance to text as choosing sides. We were careful to emphasize what is entailed in critical reading of text:

Hazelwood: I want to tell you a story about these books [library resource books]. I was walking around campus yesterday with these books and I saw a friend who is from Argentina. He looked at them and said, "Oh, you're teaching about the Mexican War. What is this for?" I said, "Well I'm teaching a class about the Mexican War. He was really impressed because I had lots of very old books like this one. . . . And I have some books that are quite complicated because of the vocabulary. So he said, " Oh, I bet you're teaching college students." And I said no, I'm teaching some students but they're not college students, they're fifth graders. [He responded,] "Fifth graders? You're teaching them with all these books?" And then I went on to tell him how much I thought you were so advanced because you are capable of reading things and analyzing them, looking into vocabulary. Even making inferences about who wrote this and whose perspective this is. I also told him about how interested you were in listening to different perspectives in history. He was very impressed. . . . Anyway, I told him I was going to read to you in Spanish because I think you might be able to catch some words. Let's look at this. This book was written by a Mexican person. It's called, Mexico's Intention to Keep Texas. Ted?

Ted: I would probably trust this book more than our textbooks.

Hazelwood: Why?

Ted: Because it's Mexican.

Hazelwood: And what makes you think that the Mexican perspective is more accurate?

Ted: Because of the reputations of the Americans. I mean they had slaves and stuff. [16]

---

[16] There is controversy in social studies as to how to present the ways in which White people behaved, cruelties, injustices, et cetera. What is ironic is that many theorists, (e.g., Hirsch, 1987) want U.S. accomplishments to be highlighted, but if that is done, does it not also make sense to show the other side of the story? An excerpt from Herland seems fitting to address the controversies over whether to show groups in a favorable light only. Although it deals with gender issues, it can be generalized to other groups' cruelties:

"But Ellador," I protested, "why do you say-"the male Scandinavians continually indulged in piracy", and "the male Spaniards practiced terrible cruelties," and so on? It sounds so-invidious-as if you were trying to make out a case against men."

"Why, I wouldn't do that for anything!" she protested. "I'm only trying to understand the facts. You don't mind when I say "the male Phoenicians made great progress in navigation," or "the male Greeks developed great intelligence," do you?"

"That's different," I answered. "They did do those things."

"Didn't they do the others, too?"

"Well-yes-they did them, of course; but why rub it in that they were exclusively males?"

"But weren't they, dear? Really? Did the Norse women raid the coasts of England and France? Did the Spanish women cross the ocean and torture the poor Aztecs?"

"They would have if they could!" I protested.

"So would the Phoenician women and Grecian women in the other cases-wouldn't they?" I hesitated. (Gilman, as cited by Lane, 1979/1915. pp. xvi-xvii)

Hazelwood: You bring up a very interesting point because one of the issues about Texas was that Mexicans didn't have slavery during those years. They had abolished slavery. But the Americans that moved into Texas wanted to have slaves. So yes, they had a bad reputation for that, that's very true. Alex?

Alex: I think that the book would be better instead of the textbook because all we've been hearing is the American's perspectives and maybe it would be a good source if we heard their side of the story.

Hazelwood: Very good point.

Hasbach: You know I want to mention something though. I think we need to be careful when we say that one is better than the other. I think what's really important to realize is that both are valuable to look at in order to see different perspectives. I guess one of the things I'm concerned about is that in social studies Ms. Hoekwater and I have been saying is that this perspective is bad in your textbook. And we don't mean to say that at all. What we mean to say is that this is one perspective and what we really need to do as historians is look at the various perspectives to get a better picture of what happened. Not that one is better than the others. I'm a little concerned that we think that one perspective is better than the other.

Hazelwood: And actually when I read the Mexican perspective I'm also confused. I sometimes think, "Well are they pointing at someone as a big hero when this person really wasn't a hero?" All those questions are raised either way, whether I read one or the other [perspective]. But it's important to have both or as many as possible.

A discussion continued about perspectives and shortly after Joel raised his hand. His comments show his attempt to make sense of what using multiple perspectives in interpreting history might involve:

Hazelwood: Joel?

Joel: Uh, It's just like a judge when someone takes the stand. Like the White man will say something different than the Mexican man. That's why it's a good idea to have so many different perspectives of different countries.

Student: Yes, but you get confused.

Hasbach: Joel, I'm not sure that I understand what the connection is.

Joel: Like a judge. Let's say there's a war or a murder or something. One person says that they didn't do it and the other person says that they did.

Hasbach: Okay, now if I'm correct what you're saying is in a situation like that you have different people talking about the same event so that you can sort of come closer to the what the truth is? Is that right Joel? [Joel nods affirmatively]

Hazelwood: What historians do, Joel, is, they're like putting a puzzle together. They get pieces from different sources and then they create a picture, using all these different sources.

Hasbach: But you know, what Joel mentioned, in some ways historians are like judges. They're the ones who finally judge what is the most accurate picture of history. So, I think that's a nice analogy.

We were trying to stress that historians need multiple perspectives in order to understand any given historical event. In their beginning attempts to adopt a critical stance, the children declared that one source/perspective was better than another. Unintentionally, we may have contributed to this perception. Yet, we tried to explicitly counteract it, by talking about it, hearing students ideas, and by seeking clarification. We wonder how many students walked away thinking that one perspective is ultimately superior to another, or as we hoped, that multiple lenses need to be used to get a clearer picture?

Classroom Clip Three--Finding Living Examples of Concepts: "After You Gave Us That Talk Yesterday About The Old Woman With The Wrinkles, I Noticed That No One Laughed Today at That Part"

Our understandings of some of the concepts evolved during the year, like ageism. We aspired to affirm diversity and demonstrate women's accomplishments and visibilities throughout U.S. history. We watched a video, One Fine Day (Wheelock & Weaver, 1985), a collage of women: women of color, White women, poor women, wealthy women, famous women, "common" women, young girls, and young and old women. This video experience became a living example of ageism, and the teachable moment was used. As we were showing the video, a picture of a very wrinkled, old Hopi woman came on the screen. As she appeared, Hasbach heard a boy say, "gross." Hasbach decided that she would address this comment after the video was over, again taking an active stance as change agent with her students to show them how concepts can give people voice in their own lives.

When the video ended, Hasbach mentioned that she had heard someone say "gross" as the old woman came on the screen. She talked about how U.S. society worships youth and that we often make old people feel useless and invisible. Hasbach asked the children what that particular comment, and the way we treat old people would be an example of? One child said "discrimination," to which Hasbach replied "yes." Hasbach probed and asked if it was a special

kind of discrimination, to which another child replied, "ageism." Hasbach brought up another example to illustrate ageism, the traditional concept of beauty within the U.S. culture. She pointed out as an alternative perspective on beauty, that some would argue that wrinkles are beautiful because they indicate that one has lived a long time and has become wise, and wisdom is considered by some to be beautiful.

The next day, after reading a written list of the cast of characters in One Fine Day, we watched the movie again. After it was over, Timmy raised his hand and said, "After you gave us that talk yesterday about the old woman with the wrinkles, I noticed that no one laughed today at that part."

Hasbach and Hoekwater tried to be aware of the conceptions that the children had brought of various groups of people, including the elderly. The children had often associated the concept of ageism to their own plight as children, that is, feeling they had no rights and very little voice. This was an opportune time to show the prejudice we hold about old people, and our images of what is beautiful. We wanted to take the concept of ageism beyond their immediate experience, that is their own conception of being discriminated against because of their age, to another group who experiences oppression because of their age.

It is not entirely clear whether the children's silence was motivated by greater understanding and appreciation of the elderly, or whether they were behaving in a way they believed the teachers wanted them to behave. If it is the latter reason, then Timmy's comment is less rewarding. However, prejudice and discrimination cannot change without awareness, so this could still be seen as a first step in changing students' beliefs.

Learning Themes

The classroom clips highlighted three themes regarding students' learning that emerged as this social studies curriculum was enacted in the classroom:

a. Learning to re-think social studies and U.S. history using the core concepts,

b. Learning to take a critical stance, and

c. Learning to use the core concepts in their lives.

In this section, we draw from student interviews to examine more closely student learning about these themes. Through their interviews, eight students will tell the stories of their learning. Our analysis of their stories focuses on the learning themes that emerged for each student. This analytical framework enabled us to recognize some interesting patterns of student learning and to compare different ways in which the social studies concepts were powerful (or not) for these students.

Finding living examples of concepts. For the two students of color, Keri and Maria-Yolanda, social studies concepts were powerful in helping them name and make sense of their own experiences as victims of discrimination and racism. Yet, they did not seem as connected to the events and episodes of U.S. history. Brenda and Ricky also used the concepts in powerful ways to make sense of their own lives; they developed empathy for oppressed peoples in history and in their own world. Brenda's level of empathy appeared to be at an emotionally deeper level than Ricky's which may explain her more passionate commitment to becoming a change agent. Ricky, however, was very successful in learning to use a critical stance to view events around him.

Rethinking history through a critical stance. Sarah and Alex seemed to connect more with the first two learning themes; their experiences resulted in a new way of thinking about learning history that included a powerful understanding of the importance of taking a critical stance reflecting multiple perspectives. They both connected in "powerful" ways their understandings of these concepts to events in U.S. history. Alex also reflected a genuine understanding of the idea of history-in-the-making; he connected these concepts to both events in the past and to events occurring in the present. However, he did not link them very convincingly to events in his present day-to-day life. The concepts--even when used in present-day contexts--remained outside himself.

Remaining detached? Billy and Jennifer raise many questions for us about what constitutes and what facilitates powerful social studies learning. At one level, the concepts did not seem to have as powerful an influence on these two students' thinking. For Billy,

these concepts appeared to be dutifully learned in much the same way that the important dates and names of the Revolutionary War period might be memorized in a more traditional curriculum. He could use the concepts ably to explain events in U.S. history, but did not use them in more personally meaningful ways. Jennifer succeeded in understanding a few of the concepts and the ways that they linked to issues facing her and her peers, but these learnings did not seem to be powerful for her. In addition, the concepts did not help her develop a deeper understanding of events in U.S. history nor an appreciation of the importance of studying history from multiple perspectives.

Our analysis focuses on why these two students appeared disconnected from the concepts and examines ways in which their understandings of the concepts were perhaps powerful for them in different ways than the concepts were powerful for other students. The analysis reveals that our first superficial analyses of Billy's failure to connect with the concepts may have been misguided. The case prompted us to examine each student's starting place and to look at the process of learning as one of conceptual change: from this perspective, Billy's learning and growth was significant and perhaps even "powerful" than we had first judged given that he was starting in a very different place than students like Maria-Yolanda.

While each of the following snapshots of these students will highlight these learning themes, we want to emphasize that all the students in some way linked the concepts to their own history, reminding us that "history is your own heartbeat" (Harper, as cited in McIntosh, 1991), and to the academic life of the classroom: U.S. history. All of the students talked honestly in the interviews about their own realities inside and outside of class. From speaking with the children, it seemed that our curriculum did enable students to feel safe in exploring their own lives and history in the ways Giroux (1992) says are necessary: "The content of the curriculum needs to affirm and critically enrich the meaning, language, and knowledge that different students actually use to negotiate and inform their lives" (p. 9). For the purposes of this paper, however, our snapshots will focus on the overall themes that

we saw emerging from the set of interviews conducted with each student. We apologize for the injustice this selection necessarily does to the richness and complexity of each student's thinking.

In these snapshots, we wanted the children to speak for themselves as much as possible. For this reason, we use extensive quotes from the children's interviews to tell their stories. We caution the reader that the students they will hear are "examples not samples" (Nieto, 1992, p. 7). We are in no way suggesting that generalizations can be drawn from the studies of these children. These students are examples of the learning that occurred in this particular social studies class. Their voices raise provocative questions about "powerful social studies," both in terms of curriculum and pedagogy as well as how social studies connects to their lives outside of school in multiple ways.

The Student: Keri

"I'm Not Chinese, I'm Indian"

Keri was White in appearance. Although we did not recognize her American Indian heritage, she was proud of her ancestry. She came from a low income family; her parents did not graduate from high school. Despite their own lack of formal education, Keri's parents were very supportive of Keri's education. Keri's Mother would walk miles to school to help out with classroom events. Keri had difficulties with the written language (in particular, she was an extremely poor speller), but did not qualify for the school's special services. Quiet, shy, and loving, Keri was a cooperative member of the classroom.

Although Keri's writing was frequently illegible and indecipherable, she often wrote long journal entries in social studies and seemed to enjoy this kind of reflective writing. She had a lot to say, yet had difficulty expressing herself on paper. However, in her interviews she was verbally fluent and articulate and reflected an understanding of the concepts on a personal level. Even though she moved away midway during the year, it seemed that both the theme of celebrating differences and the social studies concepts were

already powerful for her in a January interview as she linked the concepts to her own reality.

In the interview Hasbach asked Keri to explain how she came to sit near Candy in a small group. As their conversation proceeds, it becomes clear that Keri has developed a language to think and talk about her own ethnicity.

K: We like each other a lot.

I: Why do you like each other a lot?

K: We like to play the same things and stuff and she's really nice and she likes me for who I am, not for who I am not.

I: What do you mean by that? I think that's a really nice way to say it.

K: She likes who I am inside not on the outside. She doesn't tease me for what I look like.

I: People tease you for the way you look (in disbelief)? Why?

K: Yes, because they think I'm Chinese, but I'm really Indian.

I: And they tease you because of that? I think you are beautiful. What do you say when they tease you?

K: I tell them I'm not Chinese, I'm Indian.

I: And do they tease you still?

K: Yes.

I: I think you are beautiful. You should say to them, "Hey wait a minute, I'm beautiful." What do they say to you?

K: Usually they're mad at me so they don't, they say, "At least I'm not Chinese." And I go, "Well I'm not Chinese, I'm Indian." And they go, "Oh you're not, you're Chinese." And I go, "You can even ask my sister, I have the most Indian blood in my family."

I: I think that it's neat that you have Indian in you. But you know what? It makes me mad that even if you were Chinese, that would be wonderful too. Do you know what I mean?

K: You're different than all of them.

I: Yeah, but that's wonderful. Remember the other day, when we talked about celebrating difference. I think it's wonderful that you have Indian heritage, and if you had Chinese heritage, that would be terrific too.

K: Well, I think I have a lot of bit of Germany.

I: Do you?

K: I don't know. My parents say my last name is Germany.

I: What is it?

K: Volkner. They say it's Germany.

I: That's wonderful. Well, we're going to have to think of something that you can say to them. I think that maybe along the lines of what we talked about in class, "I'm different and I'm proud of it. And I'm proud of where I come from and I don't think you should be teasing me about that. You have no right." Remember how we talked about rights and duties? And you can say to them, "You have no right to tease me."

K: And it's my duty to tell them.

I: You're right! That's wonderful!

This excerpt raises some interesting questions, one of which involves Keri's ethnicity. In Keri's life, her ethnicity is used against her by other children. That is, they are denying her American Indian heritage and "accusing" her of being Chinese. The question becomes, why do they not see her as American Indian and instead, Chinese? Is it because their notions of what it means to be American Indian do not connect with the way Keri looks? Do they have stereotypical ideas about the ways American Indians look (e.g., feathers, etc.)? Or are the students struggling with what it means to be American Indian or Chinese, and they cannot reconcile the way Keri looks (e.g., White) with being American Indian? Or, is it that in their estimation being Chinese is somehow "worse" than being American Indian? Whatever the reasons, Keri seems to feel that her classmates are denying her ethnic identity and teasing her about belonging to another ethnic group. Although Hasbach, Hoekwater, and Hazelwood did not perceive any characteristics that would suggest American Indian or Chinese heritage, the children seemed to differentiate amongst themselves based on perceived physical characteristics.

A second issue this excerpt raises is about the teacher researcher's role and responsibilities in students' lives. Keri raised the issue of being teased about her ethnicity in

the interview. Hasbach used the interview as an opportunity to affirm Keri, and help her think about what she might do in future situations. There is controversy about the "right" way to conduct an interview. Theorists like Seidman (1991) claim that one should not lead the interviewee and should remain distant and detached. Yet, others claim that interviews are political acts, and should be like conversations. Brunner says that in-depth interviews where a relationship is built over time, "shared vulnerability is essential . . . the interviewer is a participant observer . . . in-depth interviewing is reciprocal" (Private communication, 1992). We felt the latter position made more sense for our work, especially since the interviewers in many cases were the students' teachers. In this context we could not detach ourselves (which is a problematic notion anyway, see Guba & Lincoln, 1989) and not take advantage of a teachable moment. We feel there is a moral imperative involved, to help her to help herself. We took seriously Lather's (1991) idea that, "reciprocity in research design is a matter of both intent and degree . . . what I suggest is that we consciously use our research to help participants understand and change their situations" (p. 57).

In this supportive interview context, Keri used the concept of duty to talk about the need on her part to respond to her peers' teasing. Although Hasbach mentioned the rights part of the conceptual pairing, Keri mentioned the duty part spontaneously. Keri was able to use the concept of duty in this mid-year interview to talk about her standing up for herself amongst her peers. This concept of duty was powerful for Keri, for it gave her a language to think about and use when other children taunt her because of her ethnicity. It also provided an avenue for us as teachers to uncover an issue so close to Keri's identity and to support her struggle in very personal and nurturing ways.

The Student: Maria-Yolanda

Maria-Yolanda is Mexican American and struggles academically in school, although, like Keri, she did not qualify for special support services. Maria-Yolanda was most frequently silent in the classroom. She displayed "non-verbal indicators of [dis]engagement" (Brown, 1991) which led us to assume that she was disassociated in social studies. For example, we

have documentation, in the form of fieldnotes and videotapes, showing consistent behavior that included her having her back to the teachers, not raising her hand when questions were asked, and facing every direction other than the front of the room. Among the conclusions we drew initially were that she hated social studies, felt uncomfortable with the material we were talking about, and did not have anything to contribute.

We discovered, through her interviews, that we could not have been more wrong. Maria-Yolanda was articulate and fluent about the concepts we had been addressing throughout the year. She was passionately involved in the subject matter and found social studies personally meaningful. She made us acutely aware of the assumptions we had regarding non-verbal indicators of engagement. She is an example of someone who was powerfully affected by the social studies concepts, despite apparent disengagement in class. She seemed to be empowered by the content of social studies to talk not only about U.S. history, but also about her own experiences in the "march of history" (Brown et al., 1991).

Maria-Yolanda helped us think more deeply about teachers who are unwilling to raise the issue of racism in their classrooms, believing it will put ideas into children's heads. Yet this "fear of naming" (Nieto, 1992) only does further violence to children who are the victims of the racism.

> Even young children can take part in discussion on racism and discrimination. While many teachers believe that young children should not be exposed to the horrors of racism at an early age, they are overlooking the fact that many children suffer the effects of racism or other forms of discrimination every day of their lives. Making it an explicit part of the curriculum, for all children, helps them deal with it in a productive rather than negative ways. (p. 288)

The following classroom excerpt describes an occasion when racism was discussed in our class after a boy had called Mexican Americans, "Mexican burritos." Although she was silent during this classroom episode, Maria-Yolanda reveals in her interview the powerful impact this discussion had on her. In her interview, she brings up the issue of the name-calling spontaneously after being asked about social conflicts. She says that people have been calling her names like "brownie" and "Mexican burrito" since she was in third grade. She compels us to think about making concepts like racism and social conflicts an explicit part of the curriculum.

The Classroom Episode: "Mexican Burrito"

Hasbach, Hoekwater, and Hazelwood were teaching. Hazelwood was talking about the Mexican American War and asked for clarification of the term Mexican American.

Hazelwood: Now, let's think about another term that you're familiar with. What does it mean to be Mexican American?

Gary: A Mexican Burrito.

Hasbach: Hey, I heard something that I didn't like at all. We need to have a little talk here. We've been talking about discrimination. Words that hurt people's feelings are discriminatory and they're mean. And we're not going to say them in this class or outside of this class. It's going to stop right now, right here, from now on. We do not call each other mean, racist names, ever.

Hazelwood: Okay, Ms. Hasbach brought a very important point up. Discrimination comes in many forms. It's not necessarily something that we all see. It's not necessarily only calling people names. There are many other ways to discriminate against people that really hurt. I want to encourage people who hear anybody or see anybody discriminating against somebody else to stop those people. You've got to make your voice heard. And not only the person who is offended should stop it, other people should. I mean, if you watch somebody being hurt, you have a duty to say that it is incorrect.

Alex: Yes, but everybody else tells us to stay out of it. A lot of others told us to stay out of it because it's none of our business.

Hasbach: You know what? I think it's different if you fight physically for something, but to say that was a mean thing to say is Okay.

Alex: What if they start putting you down?

Hasbach: Well, then you just walk away. You've made your point.

Maria-Yolanda's Interview Response: "Not Every Teacher Will Stop and Say Something"

In an interview (I=Interviewer) that took place two weeks later, Maria-Yolanda (M) talked about the name-calling incident. She names her experience using the concepts that she has learned from the social studies class. Like Keri, the concepts gave her a language to speak out with: to name her encounters as a child of color. She had endured these things many times before, but as she explained in her year-end interview, she previously used the language that people were being "rude" to her and "her colored friends" (Interview, 1991). What struck us is that she remembered the language Hasbach used to address the "Mexican Burrito" episode.

This new language opened up alternative explanations of the behavior for her and seemed to empower her to act on her new discoveries.

I: Do you see any other conflicts at school besides the boy and girl conflict?

M: Not really. Well, name-calling. Like that's a social conflict because that's not right. There's two people arguing or more.

I: Can you give me an example?

M: I got one. You know when you came in to talk about Texas and how you grew up? Well, Gary had said, "Well you guys are just Mexican Burritos," and then Ms. Hasbach stopped him and started talking about it. I turned around and I said, "That's not right Gary," and then see we were going back and forth and then Ms. Hasbach said "Wait a minute. I just heard something I didn't like." So, that was something, that was a social conflict.

I: And what do you think that conflict was about? First, I want to know why you think Gary said that?

M: Why?

I: Yes.

M: Just for fun. He calls me "Mexican Burritos," "brownie," different things like that. He thinks it makes me mad, but not any more.

I: So, he does it to make you feel bad?

M: Yes.

I: I was wondering because I think that in front of everybody it would be kind of hard to do that. I mean to make you feel bad, if that's his purpose, I would say that he wouldn't do it in public. But he was pretty open about it that day. Or do you think he was kind of hiding it? Did he say it out loud?

M: Yes, he goes, "Mexican burritos," and then everybody stopped and looked.

I: How did you feel about Ms. Hasbach saying something?

M: Well, I felt good because not every teacher will stop and say something if somebody started discriminating against you because of your race. Not all teachers would stop in the hall and say don't do that.

I: Why not?

M: Well, they probably would but I never saw any teacher do it.

I: Do you think that they should do it?

M: Yes, well that's one big part of our school. To make the school feel safe where not everybody has to hide and just be alone so nobody will tease you. The school is supposed

to be where you can have fun and that's one rule here. That's one purpose of school, to learn and not to, you know, just to be friends.

I: So you think that learning would be a lot better if you would feel safe at school and you felt like you were not teased and made fun of?

M: Yes.

I: And you said not many teachers stop it. Do you think that it's because they don't hear it and they don't know it's something that bothers other people? or could it be that they don't want to get involved, like Alex was pointing out, that sometimes people want to stay out of conflicts because they don't want to get involved?

M: Well, I sort of think that some teachers probably didn't hear it. But still, I would go to a teacher and say he's saying this and that about me and then they'll go back and say, "Please don't do that." It's more than that, why don't she sit down and tell him that it's not right and everybody is the same inside. I mean, everybody has feelings, it's just the pigment of their color.

I: So what you liked about Ms. Hasbach's comment was that not only did she talk to Gary to stop his behavior, but she explained why this was wrong behavior?

M: Right.

I: That's very important Maria-Yolanda.

Hasbach, Hazelwood, and Hoekwater dealt with the name-calling in the heat of the moment. They reflect back on the event and think that they may have acted differently, the old adage, "If we knew then what we know now . . . " We may have asked the children what they thought about the use of the term "Mexican Burrito." We may have given a testimonial about our own hand in name-calling as children. These are some options that we thought about. Yet, Maria-Yolanda talks about how important it was for her when the teacher addressed the whole class about such statements. More importantly, in Maria-Yolanda's perception, most often teachers do nothing about the name-calling.

We are left with many questions, yet we feel that Maria-Yolanda was empowered by the active role the teachers took, saying that she "would like to make a speech out there." This is especially striking since she was so silent in class. This made us question if Maria-Yolanda was silent in class in part because of the consistent name-calling?

She claims that teachers often do not do anything about racist name-calling, and yet, Nieto (1992) tells of the opportunity such incidents engender:

> The name-calling that goes on in many schools provides an opportunity for teachers and students to engage in dialogue. Rather than dealing with these as "isolated incidents" or as the work of a few "trouble-makers," as is often done, making them an explicit part of the curriculum places them as systematic problems in society in general and in schools in particular. Then both teachers and students are forced to name, confront, and work through the racism, sexism, heterosexism, and so on that are implicit in these activities. This step can take any form, from "circle" or "sharing time" to actual lessons on name-calling. (p. 288)

As the interview proceeds, the usually silent and almost invisible student in social studies class disappears as Maria-Yolanda reveals such a powerful connection with the concept of racism that she wants to "give a speech out there":

I: You know that? I made a comment about you to someone. I didn't say your name but I mentioned that I learned that people called those who were Mexican American, "Mexican burritos," and I was wondering where that came from because to me that's so silly.

M: It's immature.

I: Yes, and this person said, "I didn't even know that was an insult and if I heard a child calling somebody else that, I would have never thought that the other person would be offended by it.

M: Well, I mean, the person that they're talking about should be offended because they're talking about you and your race and it's not right. I don't go around saying, "Oh look at that White person" or "Look at the Black person, she looks so dark." I mean I'm not that kind of person. I think we're all the same, we have our differences, it's just that our pigments are different colors. So, I mean, it would offend me because it's my race and nobody should go around saying that.

I: So when they say "Mexican burritos" they are addressing your race? Is that what you are saying?

M: Yes, well not all the time. They could be talking to other people but still you look back and they'll like say, "Yeah, you too, Mexican burrito" and it's annoying after so long.

I Is it the way that they say it or the place they say it?

M: Well, it's the place, especially in front of everybody. I mean, if I really wanted to say something I would say it to their face or something, but I would never call another person anything because of their color. But look, if all the people were in the cafeteria and he would stand out in the middle and say, "Hey look at that Mexican burrito" and everybody does it. Well, actually there's two fifth graders that really do it and it's really annoying. Sometimes I just ignore it, but not everybody, I mean, when I ignore it not everybody looks at me.

I: Yes, sometimes it's better to just let it go by. It's a judgment you have to make. What are your expectations about this kind of thing when you move?

M: Expectations?

I: Yes, well, you're moving to go to a different school. Do you think that moving to a different city is going to make a difference?

M: No, well, I think older people should be mature enough to not be like, "Well, look at that Mexican burrito."

I: What would happen, let's say if somebody called you something that you don't like and they're older than you. What's your reaction, how would you go about it?

M: Well, if it's an older person, I'd go talk to a teacher and at least have them go and talk to them. But if they just keep on repeating it, it's going to go right by me. I'm going to ignore it. It's like, since I was in third grade the Mexican burrito has been going on so I just ignore it.

I: I just want to tell you that this is so important that you're saying these things to me because what I want to do with the types of conversations that we've had is that I want to talk to people about racism in the schools and how people feel when they are discriminated against for some reason and what roles the teachers play to help, not only to help the people who are being discriminated against, but to help the other kids realize that is very wrong and harmful and they shouldn't think that way. I mean, it's not just stopping the name calling, it's thinking differently, it's respecting other people for who they are.

M: And not for what color they are or their race.

I: And their race is fine. If people were more open to racial differences.

M: I would want to make a speech out there. I mean, I would love to do that. I mean, I want to be somebody who goes around and helps the needy and things like that. I know I've had that ever since I was younger because it's like they've been discriminated against.

I: So you would like to help them?

M: Yes.

I: I think you have very good ideas. What do you mean you would like to make a speech?

M: For like the school. I would have everybody gather around and then I would go up there and have a speech about discrimination and race.

I: What would you say?

M: I would talk about how people are, I would say something like, "People are out there discriminating against people's race because they're different than you, but nobody is different because they all have the same feelings. Just because their pigment is different there's nothing wrong with them, they are still human."

I: Have you written about this at all?

M: Well, I sort of have, but I just like, I don't know. I just like talk to my friends about it. Talk to my friends like, "Oh I hate it when people call me Mexican burrito" and they're usually like, "Don't let it bother you." So, I just usually talk about it in my little diary.

> I just put, " I hate it when people call me Mexican burrito, I should do something about it."

Powerful social studies for us included the ways in which children could begin to name their own experiences. Maria-Yolanda was able to say that she now can use "grown-up words" (Interview, 1991) to talk about the discrimination she experiences. She was able to name the race discrimination she experiences in school which carries a deeper explanation than that her peers are "rude." U.S. history is not only about the events in the past, but people's experiences in the present. To give students like Keri and Maria-Yolanda a language to make sense of their own experiences is powerful social studies. Maria-Yolanda seems to have internalized the concepts from social studies that powerfully articulate her experience in the U.S. at the present time.

The Student: Ricky

Ricky is White. He is an academically successful student, trying to follow in the footsteps of a high achieving older sister and to live up to the high expectations of a forceful father. Ricky was often quiet in class and rarely volunteered to speak. He identified himself as the most invisible student in the class: "Well, the most invisible student in my class, I have to say would be, um, me" (Interview, 1991). Yet, when he was called on, or when he did volunteer, he often made astute observations and connections to the concepts. Like Keri and Maria-Yolanda, he seems to have internalized the social studies concepts, and social studies seemed powerful for him to talk about history and his own experiences. He used the concepts to develop a high level of empathy for oppressed "others," recognizing himself as among the privileged.

"She Always Asks Us What's our Perspective"

When Ricky was asked what Ms. Hoekwater would ask him on a test he replied:

> She would probably ask us, um, who were indentured servants, um, what did they do, um, and what is our perspective on the whole thing, cuz, she always asks us what's our perspective.

Ricky seems to be aware that Hoekwater is interested in ascertaining the students' perspectives on all that they discuss. He is saying that he needs to be able to articulate his own perspective

on historical events, not only regurgitate information from resources. That he included this concept in what Hoekwater would ask him on a test is significant, for he seems to realize that the knowledge that would be evaluated would be his own knowledge: his own perspective.

The "Sad Movement"

When Ricky is asked about what he has learned in social studies he talks about the "sad movement."

> I learned that the Indians called that, um, the Sad Movement or something like that because it started the part where they had to, all the Indians got moved back to the West.

Although he has the name incorrect, he describes the gist of what happened to the American Indians during the Trail of Tears accurately. He has not remembered the name, but he has remembered the pain and sadness associated with their forced march. Being able to recall names and dates is not powerful; grasping the pathos of social injustice is. We ask ourselves, what is most important, remembering names of events or understanding these events compassionately?

"I Also Changed My Perspectives"

Ricky responds in his midyear interview to the question, Why do you think it's important to learn about social studies?

> Well, so we know about our culture and what really happened because if we didn't know that, we'd have a lot different perspective about life. It would be a lot different because, um, like, if you were Black and you never knew who made Blacks free, you'd take freedom for granted.

He seems to believe that social studies is not only important for all Americans to know, but that specific groups, such as Blacks, need to know their own history so that they do not take their hard won freedom for granted.

Ricky was later asked how his understanding about the early colonies changed after studying about them:

> Our book, our textbook misled [me] because in there it said the slaves arrived in America and you think of "arrive" like I would, like come from a different country on a plane and land and see my relatives. And that's, they put "arrived" like it was, like, they meant to be there and they arrived there. And then when they really were kidnapped and lured to the boat by this, um, they found this, they used this beautiful red cloth and I didn't know that and if they lured them to

> the boat because they kept looking at this cloth and picking it up and going to the boats. And then we learned that, I also changed my perspectives cuz in the textbook it showed, it showed the Black slaves, a map of looking on the boat and see all the different decks and see how they were laid out [he is referring to the picture of the ship which transported enslaved Africans in the textbook]. And all of them were perfectly laid down straight like this and had a little bit of room to move around or flip over when they were really crunched up like with their knees like this, really crunched up together. And they lied about how they did that.

Our efforts to provide alternative perspectives to the text convinced Ricky to change his own perspective. But our alternative resources, including Julius Lester's (1968) To Be a Slave,[17] also convinced Ricky that the textbook was "misleading" and "lying" to him. We had tried to communicate the idea that the textbook was merely offering one perspective of the historical events. Ricky alerted us to this issue during this midyear interview. Later we pointed out that the textbook isn't necessarily "lying" when it states certain things, but rather it is written from a particular perspective. Recall that we had also tried to make this distinction clearer during whole-class discussions.

Ricky uses the idea of perspective in relationship to a variety of events in U.S. history; above, he linked the idea of perspective to his own learning about slavery. He also linked the idea of perspective to Women's suffrage, colonization, and his parents' views of these events. After being asked if he ever talks about social studies outside of school to family or friends he replied:

> We'd talk about how we [friends] were surprised about how the women couldn't vote and what the White people did to the Black people that were so mean and we'd talk about how surprising that was. And I'd come home and tell my mom and dad the things that I learned, tell them and they'd be surprised too. Sort of. Because back then, um, when they were growing up, they had a whole different perspective of what it was like in the colonies time. And some of it's not really true, of what they learned.

By distinguishing his own learning from his parents' learning, Ricky shows how he is relearning what it means to know history. Concepts like perspective seemed to be powerful in

---

[17]Lester's book deals with the Africans who took part in the kidnapping and selling of other Africans. We discussed this in the class.

enabling Ricky to view his own learning in social studies and history in new and personally valued ways.

So far, Ricky's words have provided evidence that he was able to connect the concepts with a new ability to take a critical stance on looking at events in U.S. history. But was he able to link those concepts to his own life experiences?

"That's Sexism"

In the midyear interview Ricky (R) shows he is able to relate the social studies concepts to his own personal and school life. He uses a new concept for him, sexism, to take a critical stance regarding events at school. He discusses his confrontation with another teacher when she said that the boys could not wear hats in her classroom. He used this concept that he had learned in social studies to argue for what he believed was his "right." The girls were able to wear their hats in the classroom, therefore, he argued the boys should be able to also.

In the midyear interview, Ricky was asked, "Have you ever heard any of these words outside social studies class?"

R: Well, I've heard, um, not really that much, ever since we went to that social studies class, everybody's been saying, like, "That's sexism" or "That's discrimination" now. And I usually didn't use those words before this. I never used "ageism", "sexism", um "exploitation", never really used those, um words. Now after social studies, we use those words. We use "justice" and "perspective" and "rights." We use all those words. "discrimination."

I: Okay, you use "justice" and "perspective."

R: Like instead of saying that's your opinion or what do you think of that, we now say what's your perspective?

I: Have you ever personally ever experienced any of these things?

R: Sexism. In school, we came to school and after learning about these in school, one day wearing my Michigan State hat and Jim my best friend was wearing his Raider's hat. Our teacher goes, "Gentlemen, take off your hats." This one girl in my class named Tara, she always wears her Nike hat and she doesn't get called to take off her hat and then I said that, and I go, "That's sexism," so we got to wear our hats. Now the boys get to wear their hats.

Ricky emphasizes that the concepts that he and others have learned in social studies get used in multiple contexts. It seems that the concept of sexism was a powerful way for him to talk to another teacher, someone who was not his equal, about the boys' right to wear hats in class.

"About the Empathy Question"

Later in the interview when Ricky is asked which teacher he would go to if he had a question in social studies, he relates the concept of empathy to perspective:

> I go to Mrs. Hoekwater, um, when it's a really tough question and stuff, but when, like if the question, like, who was somebody like that, but is they ask me how I felt about that person, I 'd raise my hand and then I'd ask Ms. Hasbach to tell me, to give me an idea of how it would feel, like empathy to be one of those persons. So it gives me a better perspective.

We view Ricky's desire to ask a teacher about "how it would feel like empathy to be one of those persons" as striking evidence of his personal connection with the social studies concepts. In contrast with Keri and Maria-Yolanda, who identified with the concepts because of their own victimization, Ricky seems to strongly identify with the concept of empathy which gives him a way as a person of privilege to act on his new understandings of racism, discrimination, and exploitation in U.S. history.

Ricky's depth of understanding of empathy is remarkable. He seems to be able to distinguish between genuine empathy and the false guise of empathy. He talks about Billy, who is a school-competent child who seems to know the right things to say in class to win approval, yet once he's out of class his behaviors do not reflect his talk. Billy seems to "talk the talk but doesn't walk the walk." Ricky says that Billy antagonizes the very girl he claims he feels sorry for. This raises the question of how we used empathy in the classroom.

Ricky is asked how talking about social studies makes him feel. He stated:

> [Social studies] makes me feel better because I understand what we're doing, what we're doing now and, um, like somebody could be tricking you and taking advantage of you and you not even knowing it. And now you can see the signs and how they're doing, see what, see some signs of how they're tricking you or something and you can say, Well that's exploitation or something.

I: You can talk to them about it, that sort of thing? Good. Can you think of anyone in your class that might feel uncomfortable talking about some of these ideas and why or why not?

R: Um, well one of the kids teases Roxanne and stuff and he makes fun of her and he's the, and he does all this during the day, antagonizing her and stuff and she comes, the teacher in social studies, um, asks him a question and he goes, about the empathy question and he goes, "I feel sorry for Roxanne and stuff," when he's the one teasing her. And everybody goes, "Well, you're the one teasing her and stuff and doing that."

I: So, you think he feels sorry for her?

R: When he's teasing her before and then some of the kids go, "Well you're the one to talk, you were teasing her."

I: So you don't think he really feels empathy?

R: No, not really. He's just saying that so he can get, so the teacher will like it.

Ricky says that he and his classmates notice sometimes that what someone says and what they do are not congruent. This means he and his peers are critical of words and deeds not matching. Critical analysis of texts in class may have contributed to their being able to appraise the words of others.

Ricky's learning through the focal social studies concepts reflects all three of the learning themes identified above. He was able to use the idea of taking a critical stance to analyze both events in his own life (sexism, Billy's "empathy") and in U.S. history (slavery, women's suffrage, colonization). He recognizes that he is learning to view history from multiple perspectives and that this is not the way his parents learned history. His desire to understand how other people feel (both in history and today) and to develop empathy is an outcome that should not be overlooked. In our own experiences as learners in traditional American history classes, none of us can remember being moved to consider the plight of oppressed groups through their eyes. How much more powerful and meaningful our own learning might have been if, like Ricky, we had felt free to ask our teachers how these people felt.

The Student: Brenda

Brenda comes from a White middle-class family, where both parents work outside the home. She is academically near the top of the class. Good grades, good behavior, and manners are highly valued by both her parents and herself. She enjoys reading for pleasure independently. In class, she was intermittently verbal.

As we look across the various students and the three learning themes, we see Brenda's learning as being similar to Ricky's in many ways. Like Ricky, she often made astute

connections between the social studies concepts and her own life experiences. She talks at length about various groups of people who have been oppressed which seems to indicate that she thinks deeply about the relationships of the concepts to events in U.S. history. Like Ricky, she wants to feel empathy for oppressed peoples, and she takes a critical stance in relationship to her analysis of history and present day life. However, Brenda's reactions to the concepts and her study of historical events in some ways seems more passionate and activist than Ricky's. While Ricky acted on his understandings by trying to develop empathy for others, Brenda (B) wanted to go beyond empathy. She speaks emphatically about her own role as a change agent.

"If Someone Was For Slavery I'd Say, 'Wait a Minute, Read This Book, It's Very Important. If You Read This Book You Might Totally Change Your Mind'"

Brenda talks about the importance of knowing about slavery and her desire to inform others about it in her midyear interview:

B: Yeah, if I didn't know about slavery I never would have known that there was it or that you know I never would have known to be against it if I hadn't learned about what happened to some of the slaves and stuff. And um, we'll read books and it will talk about like um, it will say some things about some journal writings of slaves, of past slaves and what has happened to them and one I felt so sorry for, he um, his master got angry and instead of hanging on to the metal handle and hitting with the whip, he hanged onto the whip and hit him with the handle. So he's always ill since then you know, just like--and many people would, many of the slaves would get sick or die because they didn't get enough food or, you know or would have blackouts and faint or something and they would, the masters, wasn't their fault, it was the master's fault for making them work so hard. So I didn't, I don't think that's fair that they even ever had slavery.

I: OK and so you think maybe because we've learned about these things there's less chance that that could ever happen?

B: Yeah, because now I know that almost everyone in our class probably feels about like I do about, uh you know about being against slavery instead of for slavery so if, if someone was for slavery I'd say, wait a minute, read this book, it's very important. If you read this book you might totally change your mind. You know that would be like someone came up to me and goes, "I'm thinking about having a slave, what do you think about it?" And it's like, "No, that isn't good," and they'd go, "Well why not, they're just here because they're Black you know and we're supposed to make them work"--Read this book, read Freedom Train, read what it's about. And they'll read the book and go, "Oh yeah, yeah, I understand now," and they might change their mind a little, or their thinking about slavery.

I: OK good point. OK, do you think it's important, you've talked about why it's important for you to know, do you think it's important for adults to know about this?

B: Yeah, same reason it's important for me to know about it. It's an important part in history and the adults could be the ones that want to have a slave or you know and I don't think a slave is like someone that you have come and work for you I mean they chose to do that--say come work for me. I'm making you. They go there because they want. they want to do the work because they need the money or something. So we don't say well no. that's being as slave. because that isn't being a slave. you don't whip them if they don't do it right. you don't send them away to another country in cramped boats or anything.

I: Mmm Hmm, how about just the way, do you think adults need to know it for, to use in the way that they deal with other people?

B: Yeah.

Although Brenda's example of how she might act on her knowledge does not describe a situation that she is likely to encounter (someone telling her they were going to buy a slave), it is clear that Brenda wants to use her knowledge to change not only her own behavior but the behavior of others. This excerpt from her interview also raises an issue concerning language. In class, many of the students insisted they were slaves. We tried to make it clear that although slavery could be seen in symbolic terms, they needed to be careful not to equate their "perceived powerlessness" with the institution of slavery. Brenda seems to be able to distinguish between enslaved persons and other oppressive conditions.

"We Have to Finish up This Chapter Pretty Soon and I Don't Want to"

Brenda says that she would have liked to spend more time on certain issues in history. From her impassioned responses, her suggestion to spend more time on the colonies, and her eagerness to talk with family and friends about social studies outside of school, we believe that social studies had a powerful effect on Brenda.

I: Would you have liked to spend more time studying the early colonies in class and why or why not?

B: Yea, because I think it's um I think it's fun learning about it all. um about the colonies and stuff because I like learning history and that's a big part in history and you know if I have any questions about it maybe, which I don't right now but we have to finish up this chapter pretty soon and I don't want to, I mean I want to stay here because you know I still have some questions you know that I haven't gotten answered yet which I probably will in the next few chapters but I, I like going on with things for a long time so that even if I do have a question it will eventually get answered, you know and if I forget what the question is it will come up again, either from someone else or I'll get the answer and I'll go oh I remember what my question is but you just answered it.

"I Have my Own Perspective About the Quakers Because I Like What the Quakers Were Doing"

At one point in the year-end interview, Brenda is presented with a card-sorting task designed to probe her understanding of various concepts. She is given a stack of cards with the concepts on them and asked to sort them according to which she understands really well, medium well, and not so well. Then she must explain why she put them in the order she did. Later she is asked if she wants to add any more concepts. As she sorts the cards, Brenda talks about her understanding of the relationships among these concepts:

I: Freedom, women, racism, ageism, Native Americans, rights, religion. OK you added Quakers, perspective. Now when you say you understand these well, what does that mean?

B: Oh, I understand what all of those mean and I've studied about all of them and I understand what they're supposed to be or like empathy or, yeah empathy, I know that's to try and feel like someone else or to be in their shoes.

She continues the card sort.

B: So I have women, ageism and children under discrimination. Perspective, hmm, perspective and let's see um, huh, let me switch discrimination with exploitation.

I: Oh, now why did you do that?

B: Because they were more like they were exploited than they were discriminated. Well I guess they all go together.

She continues.

B: Let's see, what could go with rights and duties? I guess rights and duties could go with, well rights can go with freedom because the Blacks wanted freedom and they wanted their own rights to get freedom. Let's see--can go with freedom too and the Quakers because the Quakers were trying to empathize what the Blacks were feeling, so they helped them out.

B: Racism is with Blacks because they were made into slaves because of their color. I have a lot for this one. I have my own perspective about the Quakers because I like what the Quakers were doing.

B: Let's see, Native Americans. Some Native Americans were treated the same way Blacks were, so they were exploited. So well they're sort of in between so I'll make those touch. The Native Americans were sort of over here with the racism and the equality and over here with the exploitation and discrimination, so those will go with both of them.

Brenda is then asked if she has ever experienced any of the conditions expressed by the concepts. She answers affirmatively.

I: Which ones?

B: Well, empathy, because I've had empathy for someone else, you know I've tried to be in someone else's shoes and exploitation you know and ageism also are the two things that I've experienced because I'm the youngest in our family. So whenever everyone else like they can go on, I used to be really upset like when I was a lot shorter you know and I remember they could go on the big water slide and I could only go on the small one you know. So they would say, "Oh you're not old enough or you're not tall enough you know." So I experienced ageism in that because they said you had to be a certain age to go on that and I was exploited many times when I was little, I mean with my brother I always wanted to do things with him but he was too busy playing with his other friends you know so I felt really bad but now, I can understand because when ever someone younger will come in and I'm playing with some of my friends my age it's like you don't mean to not let them in on something, but it just, it just happened, you know.

We found it interesting that Brenda starts her response by talking about her ability to feel empathy with oppressed persons or groups. Like Ricky, Brenda was keenly aware that there are many others who experience much more the pain of discrimination and racism. She strives for empathy with these oppressed others. However, Brenda also acknowledges that she has experienced some of the concepts we've discussed. This was a regular theme in the class: The children wanted to link what we were talking about to the their own lives. Sometimes the connections were astute; at others connections were rather large leaps, as with the issue of children as "slaves."

"They're Just as Important as Anyone Else"

As teachers we aspired to what McIntosh (1983, 1990) would consider a Phase 4 curriculum in which all people are sources of important understandings and insights that make up the fabric of history. Brenda's voice is a strong one for the inclusion of all groups of people in history:

I: Now your teachers have been talking about women in your social studies class and they want to find out what you think about including women in the unit on colonization. If you were to put on a line of important to not important or just decide that it's uh not your problem, where would you place women?

B: Important.

I: Important?

B: Yeah.

I: OK, so right here? [Indicating important on the continuum she is shown.]

B: Yeah.

I: Now about Blacks, where would you put Blacks in your social studies, including Blacks in your social studies colonization unit or would you put them at important or not important or not my problem, not, you know, something that you don't need to be concerned about?

B: Important.

I: Important too.

B: Because again, they're as important as anyone else.

I: OK, same reason. Now how about white men including thinking about white men in the unit on colonization?

B: They were important because um, because they were the ones that fought and they were the people that made all the decisions and they, I mean, they were the people that um had to pay their taxes because a woman wasn't allowed to vote or anything, so I guess they were important, I mean, I don't think it's good but I think they were very important at that time.

I: Do you think women would have liked to make some decisions if they could have?

B: Yea, definitely because I know I would have liked to, I mean I don't think I would have liked that at all if only men were allowed to.

We are impressed with Brenda's ability to look critically and from multiple perspectives at the issue of White men's power in the colonial period. She acknowledges the importance of their contributions while still asserting that it was wrong that women and Blacks did not have the same opportunities to vote and to lead. She was able to analyze this event from the perspective of the times and the historical context ("I think they were very important at that time") as well as from her present day vantage point ('I don't think it's good . . . "). It seems that Brenda is able to distinguish between being important in their own right, as she says they all are, and being important because they have power, like the White men being able to vote. We regard this as a remarkably sophisticated understanding for a fifth-grade student.

"They Deserve a Lot of Credit for Even Going Through That"

Brenda was aware of the hardships that enslaved Africans endured. She speaks with compassion and deep feeling, yet she also acknowledges their courage and fortitude during the atrocities they experienced.

I: Of these different groups of people you've been studying in social studies, who were the most important group of people or individuals that you've studied so far and why of all these groups?

B: I think the Blacks.

I: OK, why?

B: Because they were exploited and discriminated for so long, I mean they were slaves for a very long time. I mean people's great grandma and great grandpas were slaves, you know their great-great grandma and grandpas could have been slaves um, and they, they deserve a lot of credit for even going through that and a lot of people committed suicide, I mean they would rather kill themselves than go through that and I don't know what I would have done. I mean I think they were very important because they, they, I mean some slaves, I mean not hardly any at all but maybe one or two slaves in almost I mean everywhere you know are still alive to tell about what it was like you know because it was so long ago but some of them. I mean like my great grandma or my great grandpa might have been a slave I mean if I were Black, but I don't know. I just think they were very important and we were, Whites were important too but they were, they were um, they weren't discriminated that often or exploited, you know they were never and the Blacks they couldn't go to parties, they couldn't, I mean they couldn't do anything. Even on Christmas they couldn't do anything, they couldn't have a party, they had to work. So I think they deserved a lot of credit for what they had to, they had to do.

Is this Phase 4 thinking? Brenda explores the victimization of the Africans and considers them as individuals who couldn't even go to Christmas parties. In spite of their victimization, she stresses the enslaved Africans' fortitude and dignity. Brenda seems to show empathy in many of her discussion about people who were enslaved.

Parents and "Capitals of States a[illegible] Stuff"

Like Ricky, Brenda recognizes that her own learning of history contrasts sharply with her parents' learning. She is relearning what it means to know history. Her parents had to memorize many facts and the dates, and the content focus of their social studies was different. Brenda's view of what her parents learned matches Billy's definition of social studies:

I: OK, what do you think your parents, what's kind of interesting for your parents?

B: Um, I don't know, I think it's just because when they were younger they didn't, I mean they just remember basic things like what--is, what a country is you know, or states and cities you know or capitals of states and stuff like that. They had to memorize them I think and I've never had to memorize things like that, I mean like for tests and everything it's good to memorize stuff like that but I never had, because the teacher says you don't have to memorize that so that you know it, I mean I eventually learn it because of doing things with that and um, so I think they like it because they were never taught those things before. They, they um usually only had one teacher and they switched like a

lot. So they didn't, they didn't learn about slavery until they were in high school and so they thought it was really neat that I was learning about it now so I knew it now instead of having to learn it you know.

Brenda seems to recognize that she is learning nontraditional social studies content and that this social studies content is more valuable than what her parents had learned school.

"I Could Go Out Just Like Martin Luther King Did and Say Slavery Should Be Gone You Know"

Brenda believes that studying more about slavery is important not only for African-American students but for her. She seems to recognize her own ability to act to see a moral obligation, a personal responsibility, to do something to change social injustices. Is she a budding activist?

B: At first I didn't think slavery was that big, I mean I knew that it was over you know and I knew that it was over here and that's all I really cared about and now I know that it still goes on in some places. So I'm hoping that it doesn't you know, hoping that none of that ever happens you know. And I just wish it would you know be extinct, I mean I don't like, I don't even like the idea of making someone else work for you and if they don't do something right you hit them. I don't think that's right at all.

I: Do you think there's anything you can do about that to make sure that doesn't happen?
B: I could make some, I could study it more because I think I do need to study some more of it to make sure I understand it right.

I: You understand a lot, don't you?

B: Yeah, I hope so. And um, and I, I, I could be a very important person like this because I could, I could, I could go out just like Martin Luther King did and say slavery should be gone you know, I mean I don't want to be that big of a person you know I mean I, it would be sort of embarrassing you know right now but it might not be embarrassing later in life because I, it would have, I would have been proud you know I could have stopped slavery. But right now I don't know where slavery is still going on so I couldn't, I couldn't do anything like that, but if I did find out I could do something about it, you know.

We had talked about the concept of slavery being used literally and symbolically. Brenda seems to be talking about slavery both symbolically and literally. She also seems to transfer her learning to other forms of oppression.

I: Do you think that things maybe not um things still go on maybe not here, maybe not exactly slavery but things, the way we treat other people?

B: Yeah, people don't treat some other people like treat your neighbor as you would have treated yourself, or treat someone else like you would have done unto you, you know and I think that's important because that's the way it should be. If someone's more heavy than you, you shouldn't say anything about it at all. If they're nice, I mean if they're nice or if

> they're not nice you still shouldn't say--I mean lots of people make fun of other people. They might say, "Oh your hair is ugly or something," but you know, or, "Oh you're ugly," but when they, when they know them better they'll say, "Oh you're really nice, you know you're a real nice person, I really like you a lot."

Contrast this with Billy's stance (below). The question that is raised for us is why was social studies powerful in getting Brenda to think about her own role in the scheme of things and not so powerful for Billy?

The Student: Sarah

Sarah is White. She was extremely verbal in class, eager to speak her mind. Yet, Sarah could be annoying at times since she vied for attention constantly. Sarah is a bright and academically successful student. We do not have evidence that Sarah made powerful connections between social studies and her own life. However, she made intelligent observations about, and powerful connections between the core concepts and her understanding of U.S. history. She learned to question constantly the assumptions and injustices embedded in written text. The concepts were powerful for Sarah in being able to analyze resources critically, one of our own teaching goals:

> Encouraging students to ask critical questions in their reading directly challenges the passivity promoted by [textbook makers]. Instead of merely absorbing the authors' words [or the teacher's words], children can begin to argue with them. Significantly, to invite students to question injustices embedded in text material is implicitly to invite them to question the injustices embedded in the society itself. (Bigelow, 1992, p. 120)

"I'd Like to Learn More About England's Side too . . . Maybe England Had a Good Reason Why They Might Want To Do Something Like That"

In her year-end interview, Sarah (S) talks about the primary sources she was exposed to and then goes on to say that she feels she would have liked to get an English perspective on the American Revolution:

I: Okay. Was there anything that really excited you or interested you when you were studying about the early colonies? Some aspects of it that really...

S: I liked the book that we read, the, um, To Be a Slave because it got into detail and, like, it didn't just say that they went over, got the slaves, went back and (inaudible) It talked about, cuz, like, they had different things that slaves had said or wrote down in diaries or journals and they were primary sources, not secondary. And so, it said stuff like, it

had what the authors said and then they had exactly what the slaves said in his diary or journal and it had stuff like what they ate and, like, that they would just lay there and chained up and then they'd throw potatoes and if you didn't get any potatoes then you wouldn't get any food and then a lot of people died and that some people died and that some people refused to eat and that they would grab the babies out of their mothers' arms and throw them overboard and stuff.

Later in the interview she says:

S They [the text authors] told us the White men didn't like England bossing them around, but maybe England had a good reason why they bossed them around or something like maybe England paid for the land that they own now and stuff like that. So, that's where they, I mean, I'd like to learn more about England's side too, because, when they just say that the White men got sick and tired of England bossing them around so they just had to start the Revolutionary War for freedom. Well, maybe England had a good reason why they might want to do something like that because maybe they paid for the boat ride over and they bought half of the land so it's partly theirs.

I: So maybe including more of England's perspectives.

S: Yeah.

I: Did you learn anything about England's perspective?

S: All that I know is that King George got really angry and started a war against them and started the tea tax.

I: So, maybe there's a different perspective of what King George was doing?

Here Sarah is asking for a perspective that goes beyond what the textbook said, what the other resources said, and what her teachers said. Her ability to summarize and analyze the various sources that were used in the classroom provide further evidence that multiple sources of knowledge became important to Sarah.

"It Gave Me a Really Good Perspective on What They Thought"

I: Your teachers have been using other resources in your social studies class. Of the items listed here, put them in an order that shows which one helped you learn the most and which one helped you learn the least. And then tell why.

S: (inaudible) To Be a Slave.

I: Do you want me to write it?

S: Yeah, go ahead. To Be a Slave and then The Trail of Tears [Stein, 1985] and then, um They Led the Way, um, Pocohantas, One Fine Day, A Class Divided, Born for Liberty, People, and then (inaudible)

I: Are there any ones that were missed there?

S: The poem by Phyliss Wheatley and then the poem by Ann Bradstreet.

I: Okay, are there any there? Did we get them all?

S: Oh we missed History of Blacks

I: Okay.

S: Put that above the textbook.

I: Okay. Now why did you put them in that order? Why did you put them . . .

S: Now, To Be a Slave gave me a good perspective of Blacks. And that really helped because when we were studying Blacks it gave me a really good perspective on what they thought.

I: Okay, now what do you mean by "good perspective"?

S: Well, like, it had a Black, like what a real slave wrote down in a text (inaudible). The poem by Ann Bradstreet, when their house burned down and stuff and she just said good-bye to her house and all her belongings so that didn't tell me a lot about anything.

I: Okay.

S: The History of the Blacks, it was wrote by a Black, but it didn't tell me a whole lot so I put it where I did. And then the People book told us about different kinds of people and that everyone's equal and that it would be so plain and boring if everyone looked the same and every building was painted the same and so that helps. A Class Divided helped because it gave us, like it showed us a class that really did, like, experience it, Born For Liberty I don't remember reading that a whole lot, but One Fine Day was a song about women. It was kind of neat. Pocohantas is about Indians and how the Indians were (inaudible). They Led the Way, [Johnson, 1973] I'm not sure why I put it there, but it had a lot of meaning, I don't know, it just . . .

I: What was it about?

S: About women and how they lead and, like, men thought that they lead and that without them they wouldn't have been able to do anything because they cooked and cleaned and they did a whole bunch of stuff and they had the kids and stuff so that without the women there wouldn't have been anyone to do anything.

Sarah seems to be able to differentiate between materials that gave her "a good perspective" from those that did not, judging them according to whether they revealed what the people involved "thought."

"I Don't Think Anybody Is More Important Than the Other"

Sarah, like many of the other students, says that all the groups we have been studying in social studies are just as important as the others. We wonder if they had been studying a more traditional curriculum, would they have responded in the same way?

I: Okay. Your teachers have been talking about women in your social studies class. And now they want to find out what you think about including them in the unit on colonization and if you were to put women on a line of important to not important. Well, let's see important, somewhat important in the middle and then not my problem or, or not important to me, is another way of saying that.

S: Well . . . I'd put them right about here, but I really wouldn't make it any different for men or for Blacks, or for Native Americans. I mean, I think, like, Blacks should be here, Native Americans should be here, Hispanics should be here. Every person is important no matter what you are so I think everybody should be . . .

I: So, in the unit on colonization if women were included you would say it's important to include them again. And the next question is about Blacks. You would say put them important again. And then we have White men.

S: Uh huh, they're important.

I: And Native Americans?

S: They're important too.

I: Okay. But, this next question says, of these different groups of people you've been studying in social studies, who were the most important group? Which group is the most important or individuals that you've studied so fat. But from what you've said . . .

S: I don't think anybody is more important than the other. I think together they were all very important. I think it's nice to learn about Black history, it's nice to learn about Native American history, it's nice to learn about women's history and about men's history so I can't say that one group is more important than the other because they're all very important.

Sarah here not only shows a valuing of multiple sources in her study of U.S. history; she also values learning about multiple voices, peoples, and perspectives. We found it significant that students like Sarah identified all groups as important in history, that each in their own right is important. It had been a goal of ours to move from Phase 2 and 3 curricula (where exceptional minority and women are portrayed as individuals in history and minority issues and women's issues are considered as problems and absences in history) to a Phase 4 curriculum in which the lives and culture of all women and people of color (not just famous individuals)

everywhere become important and visible in history. Here Sarah indicates that she has internalized an important aspect of a Phase 4 curriculum.

"The White Men Went Over to Africa and Got Some Black Slaves"

Even though we tried to teach the children to be sensitive to and critical of language in their textbooks and in their own speech, they still continued to use problematic wording. Despite our discussions about the text's description of slaves "arriving" in America, for example, students like Sarah used benign language when asked about slavery. In her interview, Sarah was asked what she had been studying in social studies, and she responds by talking about "getting" slaves to help the colonists:

S: Well, first we started like, well, we studied, I studied the New England colonies.

I: So this is in England before . . .

S: Yeah, and a little bit afterwards, um, when they needed some help, um, some of the White men went over to Africa and got some Black slaves and then everything started happening and they had the Boston Tea Party, the Boston Massacre and the War of 1812 and the Revolutionary War and stuff.

Her response here suggests to us that Sarah was not being as critical of her own "text" as she had learned to be of written texts she encountered. Although she had clearly developed skills in critically reading text, she was not as successful in transferring those skills to making new choices in her own use of language. This represents for us an example of how Sarah failed to connect the powerful understandings she was developing in the context of U.S. history to her own life.

"It Might Help You in the Future Careers and Stuff"

Sarah seemed to see the value of social studies for the future, not for the present. Although Sarah seems to have internalized many of the concepts and could use them to analyze U.S. history, she doesn't seem to recognize their value in her present situation.

I: Okay. Now, do you think it's important to learn about all those things about the early colonies?

S: Well, yeah, I think it's important but, it's not really all that fun but, I think it's important.

I: Okay, why do you think it's important?

S: Well because you learn about other people and, like, what happened to other people and it might help you in the future careers and stuff.

It seemed that in social studies some of the students, like Sarah, walked away with the idea that social studies was mainly important for the future. She did not make a link to her own life in the present. She mentions that social studies was "not fun," perhaps this influences why it's not powerful in her present life?

"We Still Don't Have Total Equal Rights and Stuff Because We've Never Had a Woman President or a Black Man President or Anything Like That."

Sarah, however, does make a powerful link between what she has learned in social studies and present-day inequality. We talked about women and African Americans not having had the right to vote and this being one form of discrimination against these groups. She used this idea to explain society today:

I: Are there any things that you learned about the early colonies that has anything to do with your life today?

S: They built a new golf course in Florida and they [women] can't even use it unless it's Saturdays or early in the morning. So we still don't have total equal rights and stuff because we've never had a woman president or a Black man president or anything like that so.

Consistent with her view that social studies is "for the future," it is interesting that Sarah here uses examples that involve adults (presidents), not children.

"I Think She Wanted us to Understand That We Think White Men Are All so Great and That Really They Did Some Bad Things a Long Time Ago"

Sarah feels that her teachers wanted her to realize that White people did "some bad things a long time ago." She is correct.[18] We wanted the children to realize that there were atrocities committed throughout history, and we did not want to sanitize or whitewash these atrocities. As Bigelow (1989) states:

---

[18]We wanted students to realize that historical events are not benign and benevolent; instead there were atrocities committed by various groups against other groups. In this case we concentrated on White people's atrocities since they are often the ones glorified in U.S. history textbooks and materials.

> It is important that students not be shielded from the horror of what [happened in the past] the better they'll be equipped to critically reexamine the innocent stories their textbooks have offered through the years. The goal is not to titillate or stun, but to force the question: Why wasn't I told this before? (p. 639)

We felt that Bigelow's entreaty was crucial for all the units we taught. We approached the reading of textbooks with a critical perspective: Whose history is represented and who is best served by this representation of history? Our textbook had only one perspective--a benign, benevolent perspective.

I: Okay. Why do you, um, do you have anything that you learned about that these people, these men came over from England. But, then they went over to Africa. They like left England.

S: Well, like, some people that owned ships and stuff went off from, like, their colonies and went over to Africa and, like, in a book we read, To Be a Slave, it said that one of the things, they always dropped red cloth and then the Africans would go after it and then they would drop another piece further away. The Africans would go after it and then they dropped another piece in this ship and then the Africans went on the ship and they closed them in. And then they left Africa back to the New World with all these slaves. They auctioned them off, made money, got more food and went back to Africa to get more slaves.

I: What are the important things your teacher wanted you to know or understand about the colonies? What do you think? What do you think that she wanted you to understand?

S: Well, I think she wanted us to understand that we think White men are all so great and that really they did some bad things a long time ago. And she wanted us to get different perspectives because in our textbook they had, a White man wrote it, about slavery.

I: Okay. Um, also with this, what kinds of things do you think, if these are the important things, what do you think would appear on a test if you had one?

S: Well, stuff, like what happened to the slaves after they got kidnapped and how do different perspectives help you learn about social conflicts and slavery and discrimination and they would probably ask, what is a social conflict and what is a revolution. And what does the Boston Tea Party have to do with the tea tax and was it a social conflict? And they might ask stuff like, basically about different perspectives. What do you think? Do you think the Revolutionary War was necessary and why and stuff because they want to get our perspectives and how the perspectives are different in different books.

Sarah seems to be articulate not only about content but also the concepts in relation to the content. In terms of connecting the social studies concepts to her personal life Sarah was in the middle--not as passionate as Maria-Yolanda and Brenda in her discussion of various events and issues but not as detached as students like Billy and Jennifer. Although she seemed to have a stronger grasp than others on the links between our social studies concepts and U.S. history, we

consider her learning perhaps less "powerful" because of her difficulty in linking these concepts to her own experience, feelings, and actions.

The Student: Alex

"It's Good for Me to Know so That I Don't Do It"

Alex is White and is a top student academically. He was recognized by both teachers and students as a good student. He was one of only two children in this class whose parents had completed college level. He often talked about his mother's administrative job with the city's power company. His interviews indicated that he engaged in intellectual discussions at home and had a rich base of travel and educational experiences outside of school to draw on.

Alex (A) was extremely verbal in class and was willing to take risks in discussions. He was usually on target with the answers he gave and seemed to be one of the vocal ones about discrimination and sexism. In part, this may have been because his mother (as he tells in his interview) spoke to him about these issues before he entered social studies. He seems to know his own responsibility in growing up to be antidiscriminatory:

I: What I wanted to ask you is do you ever talk about ideas of equality or justice or racism or sexism outside of social studies?

A: Well, usually I tell my parents what we do in social studies and what we do in my classes. And like they'll bring social studies back up and they'll say like, "I know something that happened that maybe you weren't told yet." They'll say, this happened and this happened and then we get a bigger perspective, we get bigger ideas.

I: Can you give me an example of something your parents have told you that gives a bigger perspective?

A: My mom, she's like really high in the Board of Water and Light business and she works for the water and she has her own office and everything and she already uses these big words like discrimination. That's how I learned most of those words before we even used them.

I: Okay, so you learned a lot of these things at home already. Does your mom like it when you talk about these things in social studies like discrimination and stuff like that?

A: She thinks it's good for me to know so that I don't do it.

I: Do you think that's true? That it's good for you so you don't do it?

A: Yes.

Sexism: "Making Fun of Somebody Because They're From a Different Sex. Like Boys and Girls. They're Both From Different Sexes."

Alex then goes on to connect the discrimination women felt in previous eras to current times. From hearing this in his interview we assert that he was able to transfer the concepts of discrimination, sexism, and stereotyping to a totally new context, the television show "Monsters." This is a theme that emerged in Alex's interviews; he is able to clearly connect the past and the present:

I: Are there things you know now about history that you didn't at the beginning of the year?

A: I wasn't sure about slavery. I thought that it was just something where they had Black people mainly and they like pay them to do their chores and they would do what they were told. But, right now I know they weren't paid and instead of being asked they were told.

I: Why is that important to know?

A: So that it doesn't happen again. So we can try to prevent it. Because history repeats itself.

I: Tell me about that. What does that mean?

A: Like discrimination that was going on with slavery and everything, and sexist, it's still going on. Like people make fun of people who look different than we do. And Black people are made fun of and they're left out.

I: When you say left out how do you mean?

A: Like if they ask some kids if they can do what they're doing they'll say no we don't want you here because you're a girl or you're Black, or you look funny, your hair is not done nicely and look at your clothes.

I: What would you call that?

A: The one like saying that they can't play because they're a girl, that's sexist. And like saying it's because they're Black, that discrimination and racist exploitation.

I: What does sexism mean?

A: Making fun of somebody because they're from a different sex. Like boys and girls, they're both from different sexes.

I: Are there any ways that women are discriminated against so there's sexism still going on?

A: Like there's stereotyping. Like a lot of, I was watching this show on 1:00 on Sunday and it's called "Monsters." Well, there's this lady who just had a baby and she doesn't have time with it because she has to work and stuff. There's this little monster about this tall with this long beard that drags all over the place, and he'll like rip her toilet out and

he'll put all these things on it for like a religious sign and then she'll come home and she'll clean it up. And like at night it keeps on messing up her house. Well one day she sees him and she says why are you doing this and he says because you're not spending any time at home, you're spending all your time at work. It's like he wanted her to be a housewife and that's kind of sexist and stereotyping. At the end she says she's working at home, she quit her job and this monster appears on the sink and he goes like this [nodding his head to show what the monster is doing] and she smiles at him and he disappeared.

I: So you think that was an example of sexism?

A: Yes, like being a housekeeper and having to stay at home to work.

"Try Some Other Perspectives"

In the following interview segment, Alex connects perspective and collaboration, saying that textbook makers should try some more perspectives when asked how to change textbooks in the future. He also seems to have internalized the concept of collaboration in thinking about academic text. He is saying that, as a reader of academic text, he needs to be able to evaluate which perspectives he deems most fitting; he needs multiple perspectives:

I: After all the units that you've been studying in social studies, what would you tell textbook makers in the future to do with colonization or any other units like the Revolutionary War?

A: Try some other perspectives. Instead of just giving them your perspective, they need more than one so they can choose which one they think is right. Instead of just having one, and saying that's the one that has to be right because that's the only one.

I: Available.

A: Yes.

I: Why is it important to have more than one perspective.

A: Because that way you can get more ideas and they you can collaborate and mix them together.

He goes on to tell what he'd do in the future if he received only the textbook's perspective. He shows a willingness and even an eagerness to act on his new knowledge:

A: [I'd] probably talk to the teacher about it.

I: Why would you do that?

A: When she'd get done reading to us out of the textbook then I'd say, "We're only getting one perspective and we need some more ideas, could you bring some books in or something, or could the class bring in some books they have on whatever subject we're doing so we

can get some more ideas. Like, you're asking us to say something that we don't even know about but the textbook is not telling us."

Alex recognizes that he can challenge authority and offer alternatives to the teacher. He suggests that in a classroom the students can bring in books that would provide additional perspectives. Alex uses these concepts fluently in regard to the content of U.S. history and to present day life. He is similarly fluent as he talks about invisible and visible groups in history:

I: What groups have sometimes been invisible in history?

A: Women, colored people, definitely not men, men have been very visible, and like people from different countries, when they're kidnapped and taken over here. They don't, they're left out and they're used for improper reasons.

I: When you say used for improper reasons, is there a word we've used that would explain that idea?

A: Exploitation.

I: Right. Are there ways to change invisibility? Are there things we can do to make groups visible?

A: Yes, we can get more perspectives on them instead of the man's perspective. We can get some colored people and some women's perspectives and asked them what they think happened.

Thus, Alex is especially skillful in making connections between our study of U.S. history and present day life. In the following interview excerpt, he considers the concept of power, relating the power of business and money in society today to the power of hunters of enslaved persons in the day of the underground railroad.

A: They would take their guns and their rifles and they would go in the woods looking for the slaves and like they would if they saw them they would just shoot them and bring them back for money, because that's all really cared about. They didn't care about anybody, they just cared about money, power, and business.

I: Now when you say money and business and you use that with power, why do you do that? Why do you link power with money and business?

A: Because usually people with money and artillery, like an army has power because they can do whatever they want because nobody else will be able to stop them.

We noticed a difference in the ways in which Alex and Maria-Yolanda, Keri, Ricky, and Brenda connected the concepts and U.S. history to present day life. While these students linked the concepts to particular incidents in their personal lives, Alex linked the concepts

more generally to present-day society. He could identify many instances in society which illustrated these concepts in action, but he only rarely linked the concepts to his own personal experience. However, there were a few occasions in which we saw evidence that Alex was developing a sense of empathy and appreciation for oppressed persons. His use of his intellectual knowledge in developing this empathy contrasts with Sarah's equally intellectual but more dispassionate stand as well as with Maria-Yolanda's more personal, passionate stance which was not so clearly linked to historical analysis.

Although both Sarah and Alex had deep understandings of the concepts in relationship to U.S. history, Alex more frequently gives us glimpses in his interviews of his own feelings in relationship to these concepts. For example, in this interview excerpt it seems that he is speaking with empathy about the Civil Rights movement:

I: How about the Civil Rights Movement, are there any famous people?

A: Martin Luther King.

I: Do you know anything about him?

A: He was a Black man who helped. When he was young he (inaudible) like he was a priest or something and he wanted to do (inaudible) so he would go out and tell these White people off. Like, he would say, we have as much a right as you do to live on this planet and we should be able to have the same rights. Like, look at these people, they don't have food or shelter and you have everything you need and you don't even think about what these people are going through.

But this is clearly not the same level of empathy that we saw in the interviews with Maria-Yolanda, Keri, Brenda, and Ricky.

"It Didn't Tell the Whole Story: It Just Summarized It"

Like Sarah and many other students, Alex learned to read texts critically. When he was asked what resources did not help him, he identified the textbook. His explanation is an astute criticism of textbooks. Alex realizes that powerful social studies does not come from the textbook. He is certain that multiple perspectives are necessary to get the whole story:

I: What was the thing that didn't help you [learn the best]? What was the worst?

A: Probably the textbook.

I: Why?

A: Because it didn't tell the whole story; it just summarized it.

Alex continues with his critique of the textbook in the context of a question that asked about how he feels about social studies. Where would he put himself on the continuum of "excited" to "bored?"

I: You put yourself sort of in the middle between excited and bored, why?

A: Well, at first I was kind of excited. Like sometimes, most of the time, it's kind of exciting and then there's time when you feel bored.

I: Were there any times that were especially exciting?

A: Well, probably like having a guest in.

I: How about when you were especially bored?

A: Reading the textbook.

Alex finds many flaws with the textbook. He clearly articulates that the textbook only gives him part of the story of history. Overall, Alex seems to have internalized many of the concepts in social studies. He relates them to historical events in the past and events in the present. He uses the concepts and his ability to read texts critically to analyze both the school textbook and situations ("texts") outside school--for example, his critique of television shows. In the interview, he seems to realize that if he's not part of the solution, he's part of the problem. He knows that he needs to be careful not to grow up and "do it," that is, grow up and discriminate. Yet, earlier in the classroom discourse ("Mexican Burrito" incident) he had spoken about being told by others to stay out of discrimination if it is taking place. Alex was articulate about the concepts and open to analyzing society and history in terms of these concepts. Could his learning and his openness be explained at least in part by the atypical (for this school population) parental support he received? Given that he was at a different starting place than many other students, did our use of the concepts help him grow in significant ways? Why didn't he develop a more passionate stance towards these issues?

The Student: Jennifer

"I Think There is Probably a Reason We Learn About it But I Don't Know Why"

Jennifer is White and is an average student academically. She is extremely cooperative, friendly, outgoing, and eager to please. She has many friends and was identified by other students as being "popular." She volunteered to speak quite regularly. From classroom observations she seemed to be usually on task, and her responses were intelligent.

From the teachers' observations in class, she seemed to enjoy social studies and understand the concepts well. From her interviews we found that this was not necessarily the case. She often replied with, "I don't know," which was rare among the students we interviewed, yet she did understand some of the concepts well. In analyzing this midway interview it seemed painful for the interviewer to do, like "pulling teeth." This was totally unexpected for us, considering Jennifer's active participation in class. We wondered whether it was the context of the interview that was uncomfortable for her or whether she just had not connected with the concepts in very powerful ways. Our analysis reveals that although she connected powerfully to some of the particular concepts, the content and overall purposes of social studies did not appear to be powerful for her.

I: Why is it important to learn social studies?

J: So that you know about the past and what they think is going to come up, the future. You learn more about what was happening in the past.

I: Why are these important things to know? Why should we know about the past? Do you have any ideas?

J: No.

I: If we're in the present right now, why is it important to know about what happened in earlier

J: I don't know.

I: Okay, maybe you can think about it and hop in with it later. Okay, let's talk about the studying you did about the early colonies in America. Can you tell me what you studied about the early colonies that were started in America?

J: Before the English men moved in they pushed the Indians off their land and they traded things with the Indians that weren't any good to the Indians but good to them. They moved because they wanted to be free and believe in their own God.

I: Can you think of any other things that you learned or studied with the early colonies?

J: Not really.

I: Is it important to learn those things about the early colonies? Is it important to know that before the English men moved in the Indians were pushed off and things were traded to the Indians that were of no use to them and that people moved to the colonies because they wanted to be free and believe in their own God. Is it important to learn about that stuff?

J: Maybe.

I: Maybe? Why do you say maybe?

J: Because I think there is probably a reason we learn about it but I don't know why.

I: Do you think this is something important for adults to know?

J: I guess. I don't know.

Had we failed to give Jennifer and other students like her a rationale for the study of these U.S. historical events that made sense to them? Or, did the students fail to recognize that we had in fact given them rationales?

"They Thought Nobody Else Was Supposed to Have Power and They Weren't Supposed to Be Special Like the White Men Were. That Was Stupid"

During a card sorting task in one of her interviews, Jennifer shows a firm grasp of some of our concepts--in particular, the concepts of perspective, power, and racism. She seems to connect to them more meaningfully when she can relate them to her own life and her peers' lives:

I: Were there any words that you thought you would have liked to include with theses words? Did you think any words were missing?

J: (Long pause) Stupid.

I: Stupid for power and the White men? Why did you say that?

J: Because they thought they had power and nobody else did. That was stupid.

I: Because they were kind of being one sided?

J: Yes, because they thought nobody else was supposed to have power and they weren't suppose to be special like the White men were. That was stupid.

I: Any other words?

J: No, I don't think so.

I: Have any of these words come up in places other than the social studies classroom? Have you ever heard of any of these words before?

J: On the news I heard "democracy," "freedom," and "rights," but not "duties." I heard "discrimination," "sexism," "England," "religion," "liberty," "White men," "women." I've heard a lot.

I: Where have you heard these words before?

J: In the news, at my house, on TV shows, my mom, my dad.

I: Any other places? Have you heard of them before in school?

J: Yes. In school and in the church.

I: Have you personally experienced any of these?

J: (Long pause) Power. My parents have power, too much power.

I: So you've experienced them having too much power?

J: Yes. Don't let my parents hear this tape.

I: How do they have too much power?

J: They boss you around.

I: Any others?

J: Nope. That's the only one.

I: Do you think anyone else in the class has experienced these ideas?

J: Probably power too. I know Maria-Yolanda has experienced racism because she's a different color [Mexican American]. And Laticia [African American] and Collette [African American] because they are different colors.

I: So they've all experienced racism before? Probably?

J: Yes. I know that Maria-Yolanda has because I've heard some people tease her like that.

In contrast with Brenda and Maria-Yolanda, Jennifer seems unable to grasp the relevance of history to her life and the potential power of social studies. In contrast with students like Sarah, she seems unable to connect these concepts in powerful ways to her analysis

of events like colonization in U.S. history. In the following excerpt, she tries to link "perspective" to colonization but cannot clearly articulate the link:

"They All Had Different Perspectives"

I: Are there things that you know now about the early colonies that you didn't know before or that you understand a lot better now?

J: (Long pause) There's no (Long pause). Perspective.

I: You know a lot more about perspective?

J: Yes.

I: Like what?

J: I just know more.

I: What did you know about it before?

J: It was just thoughts. Now I know that it's different people's thoughts and different people's ideas.

I: Anything else that you feel you understand a lot better now?

J: Not really.

Later on in the interview Jennifer is asked which sources that the teachers used in social studies helped her learn the best. She states that all of them helped her learn. In this exchange she reveals a deeper understanding of the importance of perspectives in history; yet, her response stops short of explaining why it would be important to know "the truth" about history:

I: Did you like learning, using those different sources?

J: Yes.

I: Why did you like learning from those different sources?

J: Because they all had different perspectives.

I: Why do you think it's important to include different perspectives in learning about social studies?

J: Because if you didn't, there would be one perspective and you wouldn't know some of the real truth that there was.

It is interesting that Jennifer feels she understands "perspective" well, and that she uses this idea in talking about multiple sources. She seems to realize that a single resource will not give a complete picture. This concept seemed powerful for her in realizing that to get at "truth," one needs to see a multiplicity of perspectives.

Being Invisible Means "Not Seen or Not Important. Or Important But They Just Don't Think You Were"

Jennifer also seems to understand some important ideas about visibility and invisibility, but again, she links these ideas more powerfully to her personal experience than she does to any analysis of historical episodes. It seems that Jennifer has quite a sophisticated understanding of an abstract concept when she is able to link it to her experiences with her peers:

I: What so you think being invisible means in social studies?

J: Not seen or not important. Or important but they just don't think you were.

I: To the other side, what do you think visible means?

J: To be seen. To be recognized and to be important.

I: Are there any classmates who you think would be considered invisible?

J: Natalie. She really doesn't say much in discussion. I don't know if she's shy or what, but she doesn't say hardly anything at all in discussions. In our class, I think I'm like her only friend. She has friends but not like good friends or anything.

I: So she's the only one you see as invisible?

J: Kind of.

I: So your definition for invisible was that she's not seen, she's not important, or important but people just don't think she is.

J: She's seen. People can see her.

I: But she's not really seen--"seen."

J: Yes.

I: Is there anybody in the class you see as very visible?

J: Mike. He brings up a lot of things in discussion. He is always asking questions. Sometimes he asks good questions and sometimes he gives good answers. He's got a lot of friends. He's visible.

Jennifer is an interesting example. She seems to know some concepts very well, and is able to relate them to her own social context. She is not taking invisibility and visibility literally; instead she is able to see the nuances in the concepts. Why does she relate well to some of the concepts, yet not know why she is learning about historical events?

The Student: Billy

"So You Can Answer Questions at School"

Billy is White, and he comes from family where the Bible is read and interpreted literally everyday. He has three sisters, and while his mother and his sisters do "girl" things, he and his father do "men" things. His family is a loving and caring one; he usually chose to hang around his younger sisters at recess time and always watched out for them on the way home from school. Even at his young age he felt that women should be in the home. At times, in class, he would make sexist remarks.

Billy is considered to be gifted. In his spare time he was always quietly reading a book. He was frequently verbal in the classroom. His responses were perceptive in most circumstances. We perceived him to be a "school-smart" student, knowing what he would need to say and do to "please" his teachers.

For us Billy is a puzzling case, and we wonder whether social studies was powerful for him or not. Although he was almost always able to give the "right" answers to questions, his understanding of others and his role in the "march of history" did not seem to be significantly changed across the school year. He learned the facts and events of U.S. history but did not seem to connect in powerful ways with our core social studies concepts. In his interview, Billy (B) talks about who is good at social studies. He seems to know what it takes to be school competent:

I: Who do you think is good in social studies?

B: Brenda has a lot to say.

I: Is that why she is good?

B: I don't know. What do you mean by good? Understands or what?

I: That's something I want you to tell me.

B: They at least act like they understand. They talk a lot. They show they understand. By answering questions and giving a reasonable answer. They show it by being active in the classroom. They (long pause) just are active. They raise their hands and answer questions.

It is interesting that Billy asked the interviewer what she meant by "good." Does he want to have his definitions clear in order to tell the interviewer what she wants to hear, or what he feels she genuinely needs to know? Are our conceptions of him as a school-smart student influencing our analyses of his behavior, therefore distorting our image of him?

What was striking to us was that Billy was rarely passionate about any of his answers to the questions in the interviews, either when he was talking about the history of others or himself:

I: I'll show you the question and I'm sure this will ring a lot of bells. What social conflicts continued to fester after colonization which helped to contribute to the outbreak of the Civil War and erupted once again during the Civil Rights era? Now you remember? Okay, could you tell me what that means?

B: Like what problems continued to get worst and worst after colonization and which gave to the explosion of the Civil War and erupted once again in the civil rights time.

I: Okay. Now you mentioned some social conflicts like women being discriminated against. Can you think of other social conflicts that you talked about?

B: Slaves.

I: And what was the conflict about?

B: The North didn't want slaves and the South had and wanted them. (Long pause)

Billy is able to come up with appropriate answers, emphasizing his knowledge of events in history, and yet he seems to disengage himself from the plight of various groups he talks about. He keeps his discussions brief, at times abrupt. This is in stark contrast to other students who seem deeply connected to the plight of the various groups we learned about in social studies.

In the interviews Billy is able to talk about content as we have seen above, but he is also successful in linking at least some of the core concepts we were emphasizing to the historical events. For example, he talks fluently about perspective when asked what he would tell textbook makers in the future to do with textbooks:

B: Go around somewhere and get different opinions and perspectives, everything in there [textbook] was one or two people's perspective. They just tell things like, they don't say, they don't give many opinions at all, they just give you the facts. But if those facts were told by someone else's perspective they would be a little more interesting. Like on the Mexican War they could have asked someone Spanish or Mexican instead of just the Americans. There is some bias in some things, like the book I checked out in the library, Santa Anna was made out to be a scoundrel because he burned up the port or whatever and killed everybody. But the Mexicans would hold him up as a hero. You get one opinion from that [textbook] that he's no good and you don't really have to decide for yourself because you don't know.

I: Why do you think it's important to have other opinions? Wouldn't that be very confusing?

B: You could hear some of the things he did and decide in your mind. He was a good general for his side so he might be a good general.

We know it is difficult for fifth graders to see characters in history in other than unidimensional, either-or terms; either they are heroes or villains. But using the concept of perspective, Billy talks about Santa Anna as being both a "scoundrel" and a "good general." He also takes a critical stance on the knowledge has gained, pointing out how textbook perspectives represent just one perspective and that even books from the library might skew history. It seems that Hazelwood (Colombian), who spoke to the class about the Mexican perspective, provided convincing evidence for Billy that historical texts are interpretations that might be biased.

While we do not want to minimize the importance of Billy's learning about critical reading of text and perspective, we were not convinced from his interviews that these learnings were personally meaningful for him. Despite having a lot of "right" words, he seems disconnected when he speaks. We wondered if this is because he thinks history is only good for answering questions in school:

I: So there's another social conflict that we didn't write down here but you remembered. What about conquest during the Westward expansion?

B: The settlers drove the Indians further and further West and killed a lot of them in those trails where they rounded up thousands of Indians and marched them somewhere.

I: Okay. And do you know anything about Civil Rights? Have you started that unit or do you know anything from the past?

B: Was the Civil Rights where people started fighting for the rights of all people?

I: Yes.

B: Okay, so we studied some of that.

I: Are there things you know about history now that you didn't at the beginning of the year?

B: Yeah, lots.

I: Like what?

B: I know a lot more about colonization. All I knew when I started this year was people from England came over and started colonies. That's all I knew. Now I know a lot more facts and details.

I: What facts and details? Give examples of things you learned this year.

B: I didn't even know there was a Mexican-American War. I learned a lot about the Civil War and a lot about colonization. And I learned about famous people and achievements of them and I learned about some presidents and what things they were famous for.

I: Do you think that it's important to learn all these things?

B: (Long pause) It depends kinda. If you are going to be an historian, yes it would be. And just so you can answer questions in school it's important.

I: So if you learn about things that happen in the past you feel it's important for the reasons that you mentioned to answer questions in school and if you're going to be an historian. Would anybody else like an engineer or a person in computers, or a minister, or a fisherman need to know about history?

B: Well, the reason I think I'm glad I know it is because it gives you a better idea about things. Like when we learned about Black people being discriminated against, it gives you an idea in some of the books that we brought in and read about what they went through and stuff. It kind of makes you stop and think before you go off teasing other people just because they are Black.

When Billy was asked why social studies is important, he responded "To answer questions in school." And his description of what he learned consists of a list of events in U.S. history that had been discussed. In this excerpt he appears detached from the content until the very last question. Here he relates social studies knowledge to his personal life--teasing Blacks--yet there doesn't seem to be "connected knowing" (Belenky et al., 1986). Instead he says, "It kind of makes you stop and think." Was Billy really stopping to think? Or was that just the answer he thought his teachers would want to hear? His writing during social studies provides evidence that Billy was really stopping to think about the core concepts and issues--at least during certain lessons.

For example, he writes with passion in his social studies journal about discrimination after watching "A Class Divided." In writing is he better able to express himself, is his passion genuine? If so, why the discrepancy?:

> I got a very big feeling of respect for Mrs. Jane Elliott. I thought How great it is that someone finialy found a good way to teach how wrong discrimination is. I was a little bit awed, and just a little suprised. I thought it was neat, and amazing that the class could divide against itsself quickly. . . . I know I have discriminated against people before. like when I'm with a friend and a girl asks to play I would say "NO!" but after this movie I think I would say "yes!" And I would discriminate against people or kids younger than me. I would say "no you cant play with us your to little, kid. But I dont think I would after seeing this movie. I would'nt do that the Movie had alot of effect one me! (Billy, unedited journal entry, 1991)

But was Billy able to use the concept of empathy in his everyday life? In many ways the powerful issues that we spoke about in class did not seem to have as big an impact on him as on others. In particular, we were struck by the ways in which his understanding of empathy did not seem to influence his behavior on the playground and outside of school. We heard Ricky and other children complaining that Billy was able to impress the teachers in class and then turn around and tease unmercifully Roxanne, an "overweight" girl in the classroom.

Was Billy able to use the concepts he had learned outside of his explanations of particular events in history? Billy was asked about the Orwell (1961) quote from 1984 which Hasbach, Hoekwater, and Hazelwood had briefly talked about in class:

> And if all others accepted the lie which the party imposed, if all records told those same tales then the lie passed into history and became truth. Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past. (p. 32)

This task and others asked children to interpret quotes that provided novel contexts for the students and were designed to see if students could use the concepts they had studied to look at the "big picture" of history (in contrast with the specific events in history that had been discussed in class). Billy is able to make sense of the quotes he is confronted with and link them to the concepts discussed in class. In doing this, he also shows his ability to analyze text critically. In explaining the Orwell quote, he says:

B: If one perspective was given and people learned that perspective and then people grew up and wrote a textbook with the same perspective because that was their perspective because that was all they heard. Then et cetera on and on, that became what happened because that was all anybody knew about.

Billy is asked to explain other quotes and consistently interprets them ably using the concepts from social studies. But his responses are brief and have a matter-of-factness to them that suggests an emotional distance from the issues:

I: "The history of the world is the privilege of a privileged few."

B: Most of the things and main events in history were done by men, and men are the privileged few.

I: Can you give examples of men's privilege?

B: Men got to vote and men got jobs.

I: Explain the quote: "History repeats itself."

B: It means things happen and then something like it happens later in history.

I: Explain the term "herstory."

B: His story is kind of like the privileged few. What men done was written in most books and things because women were invisible. And herstory is like what is written about her, women.

Although Billy has a solid understanding of the concept of perspectivity in history, he does not show a commitment to taking action and challenging biased views of history in the future. Unlike Brenda and Maria-Yolanda, he does not see himself as a change agent in the daily life of school or the community. He does, however, suggest responses he might give if someone says something racist or sexist, although he seems unclear about his own actions:

I: What would you do in the future if the textbook you're given presents only one perspective of history and why would you do that?

B: Probably nothing. I guess I would be satisfied to keep it this way because you can find things out about the other perspective by checking things out in the library or the teacher will bring it in.

I: Would you in the future say something to someone who made a racist or sexist remark?

B: I don't know. I might tell them things like, you really shouldn't say stuff like that because they're people too.

When he was asked what could be done to change things, he replies,

B: If people learn about things like history in school and other places I guess. The history that will be maybe more Blacks, Native Americans will have other rights like White people. Maybe, if people change. If people don't discriminate against Native Americans and Blacks they could get the same rights as White men and women. And then they would appear more in history maybe. By people learning about what happened and the young ones that grow up to be the elder generation, like the adults, they, since they have learned about that, the could change that. People my age would grow up to be the government because the people that are adults now will die and we'll be the adult age. And we will learn about this and maybe change it or something, I don't know.

I: What if you're not part of the government?

B: I guess you can write letters to the government.

I: Would that be something important for you to do in your life? To try and change things for people who don't have the same rights as you do?

B: I don't know.

We are struck by Billy's "I don't knows." At one point in our analysis of Billy's learning, we were convinced that the social studies concepts had not been powerful for him because his own actions seemed to contradict his words and because of his hesitancy to take any positive action on these concepts. We saw Billy as claiming that learning more about history will change things, yet his own willingness to act did not seem changed by studying invisible groups and oppression. However, the contradictions in the data forced us to reevaluate our assessment of Billy's learning. Considering his learning from a conceptual change perspective, we see Billy as having made significant growth in his understanding of "our" core concepts in terms of their meaning and their usefulness in interpreting history.

However, Billy does not seem to have had enough opportunities to use these concepts in personally meaningful contexts for these concepts to become his own. Given that he was starting from a position of having rather stereotyped views of the roles of men and women in today's society, is it reasonable to expect that a year of studying history that includes women in a variety of roles would transform his beliefs and change his patterns of behavior? Instead of saying that these concepts were not powerful for Billy at all, we assert that he made significant growth in his understanding but that he was starting in a different place than students like

Maria-Yolanda and Brenda. Although he did not reach the level of commitment to action and passionate empathy that others did, he did grow and showed through his private journal writing (but not in his public actions) that these concepts were having a "big impact" on him. They seemed to be raising powerful questions for him; we now take his "I don't knows" seriously as important evidence of growth.

His case raises several important questions: Who will be powerfully affected by the inclusion of certain groups in history curriculum? How can an inclusive history become meaningful to students of privilege who have already internalized many biased beliefs that affect their everyday actions? How can the learning community make it safe for children holding unpopular beliefs to explore their ideas and to make their own choices? Are the concepts "powerful" only if the students adopt the beliefs and actions intended by the teacher?

The case also causes us to reconsider our ways of teaching students about empathy. Hasbach and Hoekwater taught that "empathy" was standing in someone else's shoes, seeing through her/his eyes. Many of the children seemed to be able to use the concept fluently in talking about groups of people and their plight in the past and present. Yet, when it came to actually behaving empathically towards their classmates, they--like Billy--had more difficulty. Teachers are not often privy to what their students do in multiple contexts. To assume that children have genuinely internalized a concept from what happens in class may be an erroneous conclusion. However, listening to what children say about their behaviors outside of class is one way to check internalization.

We ask ourselves if the way we defined the concept of "empathy" was helpful to children in truly understanding the concept. Billy was able to talk about "empathy" in a convincing manner, yet did he and others objectify and rationalize the concept, thereby creating detachment and distance from others, all the while talking the "empathy game?" Is there something inherently problematic in the concept of empathy. Noddings (1984) states that empathy is projection versus reception, which is troublesome:

> Caring involves . . . a "feeling with" the other. We might want to call this relationship "empathy," but we should think about what we mean by this

> term. . . . "The power of projecting one's personality into, and so fully understanding, the object of contemplation." That is, perhaps, a peculiarly rational, western, masculine way of looking at "feeling with." The notion of "feeling with" . . . does not involve projection but reception. I have called it "engrossment." I do not "put myself in the other's shoes, " so to speak, by analyzing his reality as objective data and then asking, "How would I feel in such a situation?" On the contrary, I set aside my temptation to analyze and to plan. I do not project; I receive the other into myself, and I see and feel with the other. . . . I am not thus caused to see or to feel--that is, for I am committed to the receptivity that permits me to see and to feel in this way.(p. 30)

Could we have talked about the concept of caring instead of "empathy" in order to get at a deeper, inner understanding? Is it as research indicates, difficult for younger children, for example, fifth-grade students, to exhibit empathy than for older children (Cotton, 1992)? Yet, research also states that, "sustained practice at role- or perspective-taking is an effective means to increasing levels of empathy" (Cotton, 1992, p. 8). Although the students had been prompted to consider multiple perspectives throughout all the units in social studies, this was perhaps not enough to create genuinely changed behavior. Research also states that "generally speaking, females of all ages exhibit higher levels of empathy, however measured, than males" (Cotton, 1992, p. 10) Does this in part explains Billy's lack of genuine empathy? (See Rosaen et al., 1992, for a further comparison and contrast of Billy's and Brenda's understanding of empathy in the contexts of social studies and writers' workshop).

Implications: "Teaching Against the Grain."

We are left with many questions, and we hope others are also. Through our teaching, we have attempted to challenge and provoke our students to think more critically about U.S. history and about their own lives as history in-the-making. Through writing about these efforts and sharing analyses of our own learning and our students' learning, we have attempted to challenge and provoke other educators to think more critically about the U.S. history they are teaching and to reconsider what constitutes "powerful" social studies for learners. We purposely strove to teach against the grain. The wisdom of hooks (1989) echoes in our ears:

> In a consumer culture where we are all led to believe that the value of our voice is not determined by the extent to which it challenges, or makes critical reflection possible, but rather whether or not it (and sometimes even we) is liked, it is difficult to keep a liberatory message. It is difficult to maintain a sense of direction, a strategy for liberated speaking, if we do not constantly

> challenge these standards of valuation. When I first began to talk publicly about my work, I would be disappointed when audiences were provoked and challenged but seemed to disapprove. Not only was my desire for approval naive (I have since come to understand that it is silly to think that one can challenge and also have approval), it was dangerous, precisely because such a longing can undermine radical commitment, compelling a change in voice so as to gain regard. (p. 16)

We want to keep a liberatory message--we do not want to change our voices to gain regard. We took risks with our learners and their parents; we often worried about the sensitive nature of the issues we were raising. We felt pain when Maria-Yolanda was called a "Mexican Burrito" and also felt pain when we were uncertain about how to deal with situations our curriculum generated. We knew we had to think very carefully about how to raise difficult and controversial issues and how to support students in dealing with them. Our attempts were at times successful and at times not. But we would not have met success without trying.

Our analyses of students' learning convinces us that the risks were not without an emotional price at times, but were well worth taking. The kinds of understandings developed by these eight students stand in striking contrast with the typically banal, fact-oriented, whitewashed kinds of knowledge that students develop in social studies classes (McNeil, 1980; Ravitch & Finn, 1987). These examples illustrate the diverse interpretations of the concepts students constructed. This diversity not only shows the difficulty of striving towards a Phase 4 curriculum, but also the complexity of making a Phase 4 curriculum meaningful for <u>all</u> learners.

We realize that it is not enough to just restructure inside our heads, it is equally important to restructure inside our hearts. As educators we need to always remember we do not teach first grade, fifth grade, twelfth grade, or college. We teach students (adapted from Nations, 1992, private communication). We need to realize that the children we teach are history-in-the-making, "I am talking about the living of life at the most mundane level, and what I am saying is that at that level--at the level of our daily lives--one man or woman is finally the central arena of history (Fugard, cited in McIntosh 1991). The discussions, disagreements, risks and challenges that took place in our classroom are now part of our

students' own history and development. Some, like Brenda and Maria-Yolanda, may actually become more activist as a result of their experiences. Others, like Billy, may settle back into being a school-smart student who memorizes names, dates, and places. Yet all the students at least showed that part of their lived history included using new language to tackle fundamental social issues for at least a brief moment in their lives.

Children like Keri, Maria-Yolanda, Billy, Alex, Brenda, Jennifer, Ricky, and Sarah are the future. The paradigm we work out of needs to allow all voices to be heard in ways that they are often not heard, in the curriculum and in the classroom. As our study has taught us, children need to be spoken with, not just at or about and when they are, they can be powerful teachers for educators who wish to rethink their practice. We know that this new paradigm of thinking about changing knowledge, classrooms, children, and society is as Lincoln states, "not your father's paradigm (as cited in Lather, 1991, p. 113)." It is more than a paradigm shift that we need to work toward, it is a paradigm reconstruction.

References

Anti-Semitic jeers mar high school hockey game. (1993, January 23). Chicago Tribune. p. 17.

Banks, J. (1991-92). Multicultural education: For freedom's sake. Educational Leadership, 49(4) 32-36.

Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Bigelow, W. (1989). Discovering Columbus: Rereading the past. Language Arts, 66,635-643.

Bigelow, W. (1992). Once upon a genocide: Christopher Columbus in children's literature. Language Arts, 69, 112-120.

Brown, R. (1991). Schools of thought: How the politics of literacy shape thinking in the classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, R., Hasbach, C., Hong, L., Peay, B., & Mirriam, M. (1991). Questions To Grow On [video] Washington, DC: NEA Schools For Innovation

Buscaglia, L. (1982). Living, loving & learning. New York: Ballantine.

Cohen, D. K. (1988). Teaching practice: Plus ça change . . . (Issue Paper 88-3). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teaching Education.

Cotton, K. (1992). Developing Empathy (draft). Close-up # 13. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Dennison. G. (1969). The lives of children: The story of the First Street School. New York: Vantage Books

Erickson, F. (1982). Taught cognitive learning in its immediate environments: A neglected topic in anthropology of education. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 13(2),149-179.

Finley, P. (1988) Malaise of the spirit: A case study. Fairbanks, Alaska: College of Rural Alaska, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Freire, P. (1985). Pedagogy of the oppressed (M.B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1968)

Fugard, Sheila (1983). A revolutionary woman: A novel. New York: George Brazillier Inc.

Gannett, C. (1992). Gender and the journal: Diaries and academic discourse. New York: State University of New York Press.

Gates, H., L. Jr. (1992). Loose canons: Notes on the culture wars. New York: Oxford University Press.

Giroux, H. (1992). Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic government. Educational Researcher. 21 4-11

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. CA: Sage.

Hasbach, C., Hazelwood, C., Hoekwater, E., Roth, K,. & Michell, M. (1992) Holistic literacy: Voices integrating classroom texts in social studies (Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 64) East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching. Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

Hirsch, E. D. Jr. (1987). Cultural literacy. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of Professional Development Schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

hooks, B. (1989). Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black. Boston, MA: South End.

Humm, M. (1990). The dictionary of feminist theory. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Johnston, J. (1973). They led the way. New York: Scholastic.

Kozol, J. (1990). The night is dark and I am far from home. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Lane, A. J. (1979) Introduction to C.P. Gilman, HERLAND. New York: Pantheon Books (Original work published 1915).

Lather, P. (1991). Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern. New York: Routledge, Chapman, & Hall.

Lester, J. (1968). To be a slave. New York: Scholastic.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maybe the white men made it up. (1992, Winter/Spring). Changing Minds, pp. 4-8.

McIntosh, P. (1983). Interactive phases of curricular re-vision: A feminist perspective (Working Paper No. 124). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies (Working Paper No. 189). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, P. (1990). Interactive phases of curricular and personal re-vision with regard to race (Working Paper No. 219). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, P. (1991, July) Presentation at SEED (Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity) Workshop, Palo Alto, California.

McNeil, L. M. (1980). Negotiating classroom knowledge: Beyond achievement and socialization. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts, April.

Mehan, H. (1980). The competent student. Anthropology and Education Quarterly. 11 3 131-152

Moraga, C., & Anzaldua, G. (Eds.). (1983). This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color. New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education. New York: Longman.

Noddings, N. (1984) Caring: A feminine approach to ethics & moral education. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Orwell, G. (1961). 1984. New York: Signet Classic

Posner, G. J., Strike, K. A., Hewson, P. W. & Gertzog, W. A. (1982) Accommodation of a scientific conception: Toward a theory of conceptual change. Science Education, 77, 211-227.

Ravitch, D., & Finn, C.E., Jr. (1987). What do our 17-year-olds know? New York: Harper & Row.

Rodriguez, R. (1982). Hunger of memory: The education of Richard Rodriguez. New York: Bantam Books.

Rosaen, C. L., Linquist, B., Peasley, K. L. & Hazelwood, C. (1992). Integration from the student perspective: Constructing meaning in a writers' workshop. (Elementary Subjects Center No. 62). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

Roth, K. (1989). Conceptual understanding and higher level thinking in the elementary science curriculum: Three perspectives Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 12). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

Roth, K.J. (1989-90) Science education: It's not enough to "do" or "relate." American Educator, 13(4), 16-22; 46-48.

Roth, K., Ligett, C., Derksen, J., Hasbach, C., Hoekwater, E., Masters, J., & P. Woodhams. (1992) Many voices: Learning to teach social studies. (Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 86). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching and the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

Seidman, I.E. (1991). Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences. New York: Teachers College Press.

Seuss, D. (1971). The Lorax. New York: Random House Books for New Readers.

Stein, R. C. (1985). The story of the Trail of Tears. Chicago: Regensteiner.

Steinem, G. (1992). Revolution from within: A book of self-esteem. Boston: Little, Brown.

Style, E. (July, 1992). Final newsletter (part one) SEED [Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity] #5 leaders group. New Jersey.

Thomas, R. W. (1992, November) Issues in diversity: Implications for teaching, learning and teacher education. Presentation given at the Michigan Partnership for New Education, Professional Development Schools Fall Institute, East Lansing.

Wheelock, M., & Weaver, K. (1985). One fine day [Video]. Hollywood, CA: Circe Records & Ishtar Films.

Wiggins, G. (1989, November). The futility of trying to teach everything of importance. Educational Leadership, 47(3) 44-48, 57-59.

Zeichner, K. (in press). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. (NCRTL Special Report). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Appendices

Educators' and Students' "worksheets"

The following activities may be useful in talking about racism in your classroom (no matter which level). Please note, the worksheets on "OTHERNESS" and "TARGETING" (SEED material-created by E., Style, & P., McIntosh, co-facilitators [1991])can evoke feelings of pain and/or anger.

Appendix A

"Otherness" - Moving ourselves form margin to center, from center to margin

1. People who were OTHER to me when I was in school or people whose OTHERNESS (to my experience) make me feel awkward now, painfully aware of my difference form them
2. A way I felt OTHER when I was in school or a way I am seen as OTHER now
3. How my own experience of OTHERNESS has strengthened me
4. How my own experience of OTHERNESS has impeded me
5. I think school classrooms and curriculum can deal more effectively with OTHERNESS by Imagine the school curriculum if diversity were at the center

Appendix B

TARGETING

A. THINK OF A TIME YOU WERE TARGETED FOR SOME OPPRESSION

1. What was it like? How did it feel?

2. Was the targeting intentional or unintentional?

3. Did anyone intervene as your ally? If so, what did they do? If not, what would you have wanted an ally to do?

B. THINK OF A TIME YOU WERE AN ALLY TO SOMEONE ELSE.

QUESTION What are the qualities of allies?

Appendix C

Questions to go along with the Maria-Yolanda example

1. Maria-Yolanda named her "otherness." Is this important? Why? Why not?
2. Hasbach and Hazelwood became allies for her. Maria-Yolanda seems to indicate this is important, why?
3. What does Maria-Yolanda say about the teacher's role in regard to dealing with 'otherness' and targeting?
4. In what ways was Gary made to feel "other"/targeted? How could this have been different?
5. What would/could you have done differently in the same circumstances?
6. Teachers as allies, what are their characteristics?

Appendix D

Nieto (1992) asks the following questions to help educators think back to a time they might have observed name-calling, and racist and exclusionary actions.

> Most teachers have witnessed name-calling and racist and exclusionary behavior in their schools. Think back to the last such incident you saw.
>
> [1.] How was it handled?
> [2.] Would you handle it any differently now?
> [3.] How would you make it an explicit part of the curriculum?
> [4.] What material might you use to help you? (p. 289)